

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Pierog1968>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
A COMPARISON OF TRAINED AND UNTRAINED COUNSELLORS
IN THEIR ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE EMPATHY,
CONGRUENCE AND ACCEPTANCE

by



RITA HELEN PIEROG

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

JUNE 1968

Thesis
1968 (F)
174

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "A Comparison of Trained and Untrained Counsellors in their Ability to Communicate Empathy, Congruence and Acceptance" submitted by Rita Helen Pierog in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to the following persons for their assistance during the development of this thesis:

Dr. Harvey W. Zingle, chairman of her committee, for his help in choosing the research topic, for his constant encouragement, his helpful criticism, and his gracious understanding;

Dr. Donald C. Fair and Dr. R. Patterson for their helpful advice and constructive criticism;

Dr. John G. Paterson for his invaluable assistance in selecting the counsellors and the schools;

the counsellors and the students, who participated in the study, for their cooperation;

Mrs. Denise Stocco, Mrs. Louise Plewes and Mrs. Arlane Murphy, who did the typing;

Mr. Walter Muir and Mr. K. Bay for their advice and assistance in the statistical analysis of the data.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if trained counsellors are perceived by their counsellees as being more empathic, more congruent and more accepting than are untrained counsellors by their counsellees.

The sample consisted of one hundred and ten seventh, eighth and ninth grade students who were the counsellees of seven trained counsellors and ninety seventh, eighth and ninth grade students who were the counsellees of seven untrained counsellors. The counsellors and counsellees were from fourteen public schools in Edmonton and district. The subjects were counselled at least twice between September, 1967 and January, 1968. A Relationship Questionnaire was administered to the two hundred counsellees to test the following hypotheses: that the trained counsellors would be perceived by their counsellees as being more empathic, more congruent and more accepting than untrained counsellors would be perceived by their counsellees; that the trained counsellors would be perceived by their counsellees as manifesting more of the overall conditions than the untrained counsellors would be perceived by their counsellees.

An analysis of covariance, controlling for socio-economic status of the family, failed to indicate any significant difference between the means of the two groups on empathy, congruence and total scores. However, the trained counsellors were perceived by their counsellees as being more accepting than were the untrained counsellors perceived by their counsellees.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I THE PROBLEM	1
II REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	7
I. Introduction	7
II. What Counselees Want in a Counselling Relationship	7
III. Positive Effects of the Therapeutic Conditions . . .	9
IV. Effect of Practicum Training	12
V. Hypotheses	15
III RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	16
I. The Sample	16
1. Occupational Status	17
2. Training of the Counsellors	18
3. Number of Interviews	19
II. Instrumentation	20
1. Relationship Questionnaire	20
2. Biographical Information Questionnaire	24
3. Occupational Status	24
III. Data Collection	26
IV. A Summary of the Research Design	27
IV STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	28
I. Introduction	28

CHAPTER	PAGE
II. Means and Standard Deviations of Empathy, Congruence, Acceptance and Total Scores for the Trained Counsellor Group and the Untrained Counsellor Group.	28
III. Analysis of Covariance and Findings.	30
IV. The Variables.	33
V. Conclusions.	36
1. Hypothesis I.	36
2. Hypothesis II.	36
3. Hypothesis III.	36
4. Hypothesis IV.	36
5. Findings Regarding the Variables.	36
V DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.	37
I. Discussion of Findings.	37
II. Implications for Counselling.	41
III. Implications for Further Research.	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	45
APPENDICES.	50
APPENDIX A.	51
APPENDIX B.	58
APPENDIX C.	63
APPENDIX D.	65
APPENDIX E.	74
APPENDIX F.	86
APPENDIX G.	88

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	THE NUMBER OF COUNSELLORS AND COUNSELLEES PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY	16
II.	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE MEANS OF THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP ON OCCUPATIONAL STATUS.	18
III.	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE AND MEASURES OF OUTCOME FOR JUVENILE DELINQUENTS.	22
IV.	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP ON THE EMPATHY SCORES.	28
V.	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP ON THE CONGRUENCE SCORES.	29
VI.	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP ON THE ACCEPTANCE SCORES.	29
VII.	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP ON THE TOTAL (EMPATHY AND CONGRUENCE AND ACCEPTANCE) SCORES.	29
VIII.	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED EMPATHY MEANS FOR THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP.	30

TABLE

PAGE

IX.	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED CONGRUENCE MEANS FOR THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP	31
X.	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED ACCEPTANCE MEANS FOR THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP.	32
XI.	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED TOTAL MEANS FOR THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP	32
XII.	NUMBER OF YEARS OF COUNSELLING EXPERIENCE	33
XIII.	NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE.	34
XIV.	NUMBER OF COURSES IN COUNSELLING TAKEN AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL.	35
XV.	MEANS OF EMPATHY, CONGRUENCE, ACCEPTANCE AND TOTAL SCORES FOR THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP.	38
XVI.	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED EMPATHY MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, NUMBER OF YEARS OF COUNSELLING EXPERIENCE.	89
XVII.	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED CONGRUENCE MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, NUMBER OF YEARS OF COUNSELLING EXPERIENCE.	89
XVIII.	ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED ACCEPTANCE MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, NUMBER OF YEARS OF COUNSELLING EXPERIENCE.	89

TABLE	PAGE
XIX. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED TOTAL MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, NUMBER OF YEARS OF COUNSELLING EXPERIENCE	90
XX. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED EMPATHY MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE PROPORTION OF TIME NOW SPENT IN COUNSELLING	90
XXI. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED CONGRUENCE MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE PROPORTION OF TIME NOW SPENT IN COUNSELLING.	90
XXII. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED ACCEPTANCE MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE PROPORTION OF TIME NOW SPENT IN COUNSELLING	91
XXIII. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED TOTAL MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE PROPORTION OF TIME NOW SPENT IN COUNSELLING	91
XXIV. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED EMPATHY MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	91
XXV. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED CONGRUENCE MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	92
XXVI. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED ACCEPTANCE MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	92

TABLE	PAGE
XXVII. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED TOTAL MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	92
XXVIII. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED EMPATHY MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF DEGREES HELD. .	93
XXIX. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED CONGRUENCE MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF DEGREES HELD	93
XXX. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED ACCEPTANCE MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF DEGREES HELD	93
XXXI. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED TOTAL MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF DEGREES HELD. .	94
XXXII. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED EMPATHY MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF COURSES IN COUNSELLING TAKEN AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL	94
XXXIII. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED CONGRUENCE MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF COURSES IN COUNSELLING TAKEN AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL	94
XXXIV. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED ACCEPTANCE MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF COURSES IN COUNSELLING TAKEN AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL	95
XXXV. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED TOTAL MEANS FOR THE VARIABLE, THE NUMBER OF COURSES IN COUNSELLING TAKEN AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL	95

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Although the criteria for the evaluation of the effectiveness of counsellors are difficult to establish, studies attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of counsellors have frequently been done. Longitudinal studies have followed-up counselees after they have received counselling to determine if there was any improvement in grades (Bordin, 1940; Warbois, 1947; Rothney, 1958), in vocational adjustment (Lorimer, 1944; Koess & Long, 1954), and in personality adjustment (Martinson, 1955; McLaughlin, 1956; Coplan, 1957; Berdie, 1958; Broedel, Ohlsen and Proff, 1960).

Some studies (Strupp, 1955; Wrenn, 1960) have tried to evaluate the effectiveness of counsellors by examining taped interviews by counsellors using different techniques. Rogers (1957) had raters examine such interviews to determine whether or not the counsellors manifest the characteristics which he feels are necessary to a helping relationship, namely, empathy, congruence and acceptance, in their counselling interviews.

Some studies have used counselees to rate the effectiveness of counsellors. In his study, Heine (1950) had the clients indicate the counsellor's attitudes which weren't helpful in the counselling relationship; Barrett-Lennard (1962) administered questionnaires to clients to determine whether or not they perceive their counsellors as communicating empathy, congruence and acceptance.

Many studies have been centered around the characteristics, namely, empathy, congruence, and acceptance, which Rogers (1957) and

others feel are necessary for a helping relationship. Psychoanalytic theorists such as Alexander (1948), Ferenczi (1930) and Shafer (1959), client-centered theorists such as Dymond (1949), Rogers (1957), Jourard (1959), Snyder (1961), Truax (1963), as well as eclectic theorists such as Rausch and Bordin (1957), Strunk (1957), and Strupp (1960) have emphasized the importance of the counsellor's ability, sensitively and accurately, to understand the counsellee. They have all agreed that the counsellor or therapist should manifest empathy which involves the counsellor's sensitivity to current feelings, whether they are presented by verbal or by non-verbal cues. Empathic ability also includes the counsellor's verbal facility to communicate this understanding in a language attuned to the counsellee's current feelings (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967).

Moreover, these same theorists have all stressed the importance of acceptance or non-possessive warmth in the helping relationship. Also known as unconditional positive regard (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967), non-possessive warmth implies acceptance of the counsellee as a person, without imposing conditions. This acceptance further implies encouragement of the counsellee to make his own choices and decisions and thus to become independent.

Thirdly, the above-mentioned theorists have emphasized that the counsellor should display self-congruence, that is, that he should be integrated, mature and genuine (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) within the counselling or therapeutic relationship. This further implies that he should be dependable, consistent and transparent and that he should not deny his feelings.

Truax (1966) has shown that high levels of these three attributes in counsellors result in constructive personality change in counsellees. He also found that it is the counsellor, not the counsellee, who determines the level of these attributes. On the basis of his findings he has stressed that training which includes counselling experience should focus upon the operationalizing of these variables; thus implying that they are acquired, or can be, in a practicum training.

Furthermore, it is generally agreed (Kelz, 1966) that possession of empathy, acceptance and self-congruence can only be attained through multiple, varied, supervised experiences in the counselling process. Only through closely supervised counselling experience can counsellor-trainees test their performance in practical "realistic situations, identify their major strengths and weaknesses in the counselling process, experiment with different approaches and refine counselling techniques".

If a high level of the three attributes mentioned beforehand is necessary for effective counselling and if these characteristics are acquired through practicum training, then it should follow that trained counsellors will manifest these attributes in their counselling to a greater extent than will untrained counsellors. For the purpose of this study, a trained counsellor is defined as one who has received a graduate diploma or master's degree in counselling, based on a program which includes practicum training. An untrained counsellor may be defined as a teacher who has been assigned counsellor duties for at least half of her (his) time but who does not have a practicum.

It is the purpose of this study to determine if trained counsellors

are perceived by their counselees as manifesting empathy, acceptance and self-congruence to a greater extent than are untrained counsellors by their counselees. This will be done by having counselees rate their counsellors on an appropriate questionnaire.

Limitations to the Study

The generalizations to be drawn as conclusions in this study are made in the light of the following limitations:

Instrument. The reliability of the Relationship Questionnaire which was used by the counselees to rate their counsellors is low (about .55). With a reliability coefficient that low, it is very probable that real differences in the groups compared could be missed. On the other hand, there is no reason to expect that the error resulting from the unreliability of this measure is systematic (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967).

Sample. In the early planning of this study, it was the intention of this investigator to compare trained and untrained counsellors at the junior high and senior high school levels. However, when making arrangements for the sample with the school systems involved, administrative difficulties were encountered; therefore, only junior high counsellors were chosen to participate in this study.

The number of available junior high school counsellors was limited. As a result, it was possible to obtain only seven trained and seven untrained counsellors for this study. This is a major limitation of this study.

Number of interviews. The counsellors were requested by the

present writer to keep a record of the number of interviews between the counsellor raters and the counsellors rated. The intended purpose of this request was to make it possible to control for this variable. However, several of the participating counsellors failed to make this information available. Therefore, it was necessary to proceed with the study without information on this variable which may or may not be pertinent.

Previous Counsellor Experience. The counsellor subjects in this study were asked to rate their present counsellors. There is little doubt that experience with previous counsellors would have an effect on the ratings which these counsellors made of their present counsellors. For instance, it was observed by this researcher that several counsellors, who were asked in the present research to rate their "trained" counsellors, had had untrained counsellors during the previous academic term. The bias introduced by this uncontrolled variable could be a limitation.

Time Lapse Since Last Interview. The length of time between the date on which the rating was made and the date of the last interview of the counsellor rated varied from counsellor to counsellor. Some of the counsellors' ratings were based on interviews that occurred as late as the first of January while others were based on interviews that terminated in October, November or December. Whether or not this time discrepancy has an effect on ratings is not known.

Reasons for Counselling. Counselling interviews in the junior high school are frequently categorized as either educational, vocational

or personal adjustment counselling (Caravelle, 1958). It is possible that empathy, congruence and acceptance are communicated to a greater extent in counselling interviews of the personal adjustment type. No record of the category of counselling interview in which any one student was involved is available. Category of counselling might be a confounding variable.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

Studies by Ends and Page (1957), Fiedler (1950), Heine (1950), Quinn (1950), Seeman (1954) and Truax (1967) show that counselling, characterized by a helping relationship is associated with the greatest amount of positive change in the counsellee. This helping relationship has been defined by Rogers (1958) as "one in which one of the participants intends that there should come about, in one or both parties, more appreciation of and more functional use of the latent inner resources of the individual". The characteristics of such a relationship as proposed by Rogers and other therapists are:

1. Empathy,
2. Self-congruence,
3. Acceptance (unconditional positive regard).

II. WHAT COUNSELLEES WANT IN A COUNSELLING RELATIONSHIP

Studies by the National Vocational Guidance Association (1949), Heine (1950), Form (1953), Cuttle (1953), Arbuckle (1956), Caravello (1958), Pohlman (1960), Shultz (1963), Mills (1965) and Carlin (1965) all reveal that counsellees look for and want these characteristics in their counsellors.

Heine (1950) studied individuals who had gone for psychotherapeutic help to psychoanalytic, non-directive and Adlerian therapists.

Regardless of the type of therapy, these clients report similar changes in themselves. However, their perception of the relationship is of particular interest here. The clients indicated that the following attitudinal elements in the relationship accounted for the changes: the trust they felt in the therapist, being understood by the therapist, the feeling of independence they had in making choices and decisions. They also reported that the following attitudes displayed by the therapist were not helpful: lack of interest on the part of the therapist, remoteness or distance and an over-degree of sympathy.

In 1965, Carlin conducted a study to develop a sharper awareness of the negative reactions of college students to their counselling experiences. Every fifth student (random sampling) out of a college student body of 4,500 students was chosen. There was an equal number of males and females. The sampling was done in the Spring; in the Fall, each student was assigned a counsellor whom he was urged to use. In the Spring, each counsellee was asked to reply to the following: "If you have not been satisfied with the counselling received at the Counselling Centre, please briefly state the reasons for the same." Ninety-seven did.

Fifteen percent of these said that the counsellors were too impersonal, lacked interest, were cold, lacked warmth, did not seem to care and were too brief. Twenty percent of the ninety-seven college students who replied said that the counsellors seemed rushed, were too busy, were too hurried, and lacked time for them.

In these studies, the counsellees or clients, indicated that the counsellors or therapists should communicate interest, warmth and

understanding in a counselling relationship. These same clients also felt that counsellors or therapists should display trust in their counsellees and should let them make their own choices and decisions.

III. POSITIVE EFFECTS OF THESE CHARACTERISTICS

Counsellees may want empathy, congruence and acceptance, but do these contribute to success in counselling? Many studies, taking success in counselling to mean constructive personality change in the counsellee, have found this to be so. Based on Roger's theoretical formulation, Halkides (1958) conducted a study in which he hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship between the extent of constructive personality change in the counsellee and four counsellor variables, namely the degree of empathic understanding of the counsellee manifested by the counsellor, the degree of acceptance (unconditional positive regard) manifested by the counsellor toward the counsellee, the extent to which the counsellor is genuine (congruent) and the extent to which the counsellor's response matches the counsellee's expression.

She selected early and late "recorded" interviews for each of the ten most successful cases and each of the ten least successful cases. She then randomly selected nine client-counsellor 'inter-action' units from each interview; three judges listened to these at four different times and then rated them. Results showed that a high degree of empathic understanding, of acceptance and of counsellor congruence was associated ($p < .001$) with the more successful cases.

A cluster of studies that have grown out of the Wisconsin program headed by Rogers, Truax, and Gendlin have demonstrated the positive

relationship between the triad - accurate empathy, acceptance, and counselor congruence - and the direction of counsellee personality and behavioral change.

Truax (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) has devised three scales, one each for the measurement of accurate empathy, of acceptance (unconditional positive regard) and of therapist genuineness or self-congruence. A study was carried out to see if these three were related to constructive personality change.

This study, which involved fourteen hospitalized schizophrenic cases and fourteen counselling cases from the University of Chicago and Stanford University, was completed using one hundred and twelve samples of recorded psychotherapy from early and late interviews. Accurate empathy ratings were significantly higher for the more successful cases ($p < .01$).

More recently, trends in the levels of accurate empathy for schizophrenics covering a time span from six months to three and one-half years of therapy have been investigated (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). One four-minute tape-recorded sample was taken from every fifth interview for each of the fourteen schizophrenic cases available. Five naive lay raters were trained to rate the two hundred and ninety-seven samples selected in an unbiased fashion from every fifth interview of each case. Analysis of the 1485 ratings showed that the cases with the greatest constructive personality change were indeed those with the highest average levels of accurate empathy.

In a study applying the scale (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, p. 58-68) of unconditional positive regard (acceptance) to the three hundred and

fifty-eight samples of psychotherapy taken from every fifth interview with fourteen schizophrenic patients, samples from improved cases were consistently higher ($p < .05$) in acceptance than samples from unimproved or failure cases.

In another study (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967), the scale of therapist self-congruence was used on the three hundred and fifty-eight tape-recorded therapy samples taken from every fifth interview of the fourteen cases described above. Analysis of the data showed a significant tendency for the therapist in improved cases to be rated higher in self-congruence during the therapeutic sessions than therapists in non-improved or failure cases ($p < .05$).

Studying this same patient population, Spotts (1962), using the Spotts-Wharton scale of Positive Regard, also found that acceptance (unconditional positive regard) was significantly associated with constructive personality change.

Some converging evidence of the importance of empathy and acceptance is available in a study by Combs and Soper (1963) who reported finding that effective counsellors tended to assume the internal rather than the external frame of reference with others, to be people - rather than thing - oriented, and to see people as able, dependable, and friendly, rather than unable, undependable, and unfriendly.

Similar findings were obtained in an unpublished study (Truax and Wargo, 1966) of eighty juvenile delinquents receiving time-limited group therapy or counselling. On the nineteen specific measures of therapeutic outcome, delinquents receiving high levels on all conditions (empathy,

congruence and acceptance) showed above average improvement on eighteen of the nineteen measures ($p < .001$). The delinquents who received lesser amounts of empathy, congruence and acceptance in group therapy showed deterioration on fourteen of the nineteen measures, while those receiving high levels of all three conditions showed deterioration on only one measure ($p < .001$). Significant differences favoring high levels of these conditions occurred on fourteen of the nineteen specific measures, including five of the subscales of the Minnesota Counselling Inventory, the measures of self concepts and ideal concepts, the Palo Alto Group Therapy Scale, and, most importantly, the measures of institutionalization during the twelve-month follow-up.

Thus the above studies provide evidence to support the theoretical view that each of these three counsellor-offered conditions - empathy, congruence and acceptance - are related to constructive personality and behavioral changes in counselees.

IV. THE EFFECT OF PRACTICUM TRAINING

Can these conditions of empathy, congruence, and acceptance be learned? A large number of training supervisors have been convinced over the years that good therapists or counsellors are born, not made. To some degree, the nature of empathy, congruence and acceptance fits nicely with this belief, since these ingredients are in part a description of the attitudes and personality of the counsellor rather than merely effective techniques. However, it also seems possible that even potential counsellors who, in their usual human encounters, are nonempathic, hostile and defensive

could learn to communicate these ingredients in the specific encounter of the counselling interview.

"A program for applying the research instruments designed to measure these three conditions to the training of professional and lay persons has been described by Truax, Carkhuff and Douds (1964). Evidence from this didactic and experientially-based program suggests that specific training can lead to relatively effective communication of empathy, congruence and acceptance. A report by Carkhuff and Truax (1965a) compared the levels of these three ingredients in postgraduate clinical psychology trainees and lay persons (mainly psychiatric aides in a hospital setting) with the levels in a group of relatively effective and highly skilled therapists. The contrast group of experienced therapists included such therapists as Drs. Carl Rogers, Albert Ellis, Rollo May, Julius Seeman and Carl Whitaker. After slightly less than 100 hours of training, extending over a four-month period, the levels of accurate empathy communicated to patients were not significantly different between the three groups. Similarly, there was no significant differences between the three groups in terms of the level of non-possessive warmth communicated to the patient. In a cross-validation on a new group of 16 graduate student trainees (Truax and Silher, 1966) essentially similar findings were obtained. These data suggest that these conditions can be learned, by both professional and nonprofessional persons." (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, p. 108, 109).

Counsellor educators generally believe that their students not only learn theory and techniques but that their attitudes toward

themselves and others change after they have participated in practicum training. In their study, Winkler, et al (1963) found that the members of a Guidance Institute which was characterized by a "therapeutic" atmosphere gained in self-acceptance much more than the members of a Science Institute which lacked the aforementioned atmosphere.

Barrett-Lennard (1962) studied the client's reported perception of the level of these three therapeutic conditions in relation to his personality change. His findings on forty-two clients seen by different therapists indicated that experienced therapists were perceived as offering significantly higher levels of empathy, acceptance and congruence than less experienced therapists.

In another study by Munger, et al (1963), a group of secondary school teachers were given an eight-week course in counsellor-training; during the last two weeks they were involved in a closely supervised practicum. Results showed that there were definite attitude changes in favor of the characteristics of a helping relationship; however, these attitude changes persisted more for those who were later employed as counsellors than for those who remained teachers in the classroom.

Kemp (1962) found that graduate students who were trained (same definition as used in this study in counselling) were more open minded and more permissive than those without one. Bohn (1964) found that experienced trained counsellors were significantly less directive than inexperienced ones.

Kirk (1955) showed that there were measurable changes in understanding and acceptance in the high school counsellors after a year of

training. There were some shifts in attitudes indicating more understanding and acceptance. Similar results were gained by Jaques (1953).

As a result of the findings of Heine (1950), Carlin (1965), Arbuckle (1965), Caravello (1958), and Pohlman (1960) regarding what counsellees want in a counselling relationship and the findings of Winkler (1963), Munger (1963), Kemp (1962), Kirk (1953) and Jaques (1953) regarding the attitudes of trained counsellors, the following hypothesis are proposed:

1. Trained counsellors are perceived by their counsellees as being more empathic than are untrained ones.
2. Trained counsellors are perceived by their counsellees as being more congruent than are untrained ones.
3. Trained counsellors are perceived by their counsellees as being more accepting than are untrained ones.
4. Trained counsellors are perceived by their counsellees as communicating more of the overall conditions (empathy plus congruence plus acceptance) than are untrained counsellors.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

This chapter contains an explanation of the selection of the sample, a description of the instruments used, an explanation of how the data were collected and a description of the research design of the study.

THE SAMPLE

The sample consisted of two hundred, seventh, eighth and ninth grade students taken from fourteen public schools in Edmonton and district as shown in Table I.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF COUNSELLORS AND COUNSELLEES
PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

Group	Number of Counsellors	Number of Counselees
*Trained	7	110
**Untrained	7	90
TOTAL	14	200

*Henceforth, in this study, the counselees who rated the trained counsellors will be referred to as the trained counsellor group.

**The counselees who rated the untrained counsellors will be referred to as the untrained counsellor group.

The following criteria were considered in the selection of the schools:

1. Occupational Status

When selecting the schools and counsellors, the Director of Counselling* tried to choose the schools so that the trained counsellor group and the untrained counsellor group would be similar in terms of socio-economic level. To determine the socio-economic level, a socio-economic scale would have to be applied to the occupations of the fathers of the subjects.

Since it has been generally agreed that a combination of factors such as activities, occupation and material wealth establish one's socio-economic level, a scale which would incorporate all these factors would have to be used. Elley (1961) found that the Blishen occupational scale (Blishen, 1958) and the Gough Home Index Scale would suffice for this purpose. The Edmonton Public School Board is reluctant to have the Home Index Scale given to students or parents (This is because of the kinds of questions asked, e.g., Does your family own its own home? Is there an encyclopedia in your home? Some parents would object to answering some of these questions); therefore, another alternative had to be found.

The usefulness of an occupational scale alone in social stratification measurement has been well demonstrated (Elley, 1961, p. 55). Based on this statement and on the fact that the Home Index Scale couldn't be used, the Pineo-Porter Occupational Scale was chosen to be used in this study.

The Pineo-Porter Occupational Scale (described later in this chapter) was used to determine whether or not the means of the trained counsellor

*Director of Counselling refers to the Director of Counselling for the Edmonton Public School Board.

group and the untrained counsellor group on occupational status were similar. This scale was applied to the occupations of the fathers of the subjects; that is, the occupation of the father of each subject was assigned a number which corresponded to the number which that same occupation had on the Pineo-Porter Scale. Means and standard deviations were then calculated for the two groups. An analysis of variance was performed on the means.

The results (see Table II) show that there is no significant difference in the means of the two groups on occupational status. The Director of Counselling had chosen schools in which the trained counsellor group and the untrained counsellor group were similar in terms of socio-economic status.

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE MEANS OF THE TRAINED
COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED
COUNSELLOR GROUP ON OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

Group	Mean	Degrees of Freedom	M.S.	F	Probability
Trained	38.343	1	2438.400	.660	.417
Untrained	40.561				

2. Training of the Counsellors

Seven trained and seven untrained counsellors were chosen by the Director of Counselling on the basis of the definitions of "trained" and "untrained" as stated in Chapter I.

The limited number of untrained junior high counsellors in the public schools of Edmonton precluded the use of simple random sampling. Therefore, the untrained counsellors were arbitrarily chosen by the Director of Counselling because they are representative of a somewhat larger group, each of whom is a teacher who has been called upon to do some counselling. Similarly, the trained counsellors were arbitrarily chosen because they represent a large group with reference to a given characteristic - a practicum in counselling. This method of selecting a sample is known as purposive sampling.

Many researchers assert that unless random sampling methods are used, there is absolutely no basis for inferential processes. Garrett (1960) states "that random sampling formulas apply more or less accurately to purposive samples" (p. 207). The purposive method of sampling was therefore used by the researcher who felt it was justified on the basis of Garrett's statement.

The following criterion was considered in the selection of the counsellees (subjects):

3. Number of interviews

The counsellees in the sample were the students who had been counselled, by each counsellor involved, at least twice (and preferably more than twice) between September, 1967 and the middle of January, 1968.

In summary, the subjects were two hundred counsellees who had been interviewed at least twice between September, 1967 and January, 1968. These subjects were the counsellees of seven trained and seven untrained counsellors who were chosen by the Director of Counselling from schools in the city of Edmonton and district.

II. INSTRUMENTATION

1. Relationship Questionnaire

The instrument used in this study was the Relationship Questionnaire (see Appendix A). This questionnaire contains one hundred and forty-one statements regarding the counsellor's behavior toward the counsellee in the interviewing session. Each statement is to be responded to by the counsellee as being either true or false. In some cases, a true response is the desired one; in others, a false response is correct.

The Relationship Questionnaire is not a timed "test". This questionnaire can be completed in approximately forty minutes.

A total score and three subscores can be obtained from this questionnaire. The correct responses (see Appendix A) for empathy are totalled to give a subscore for empathy. Similarly, the correct responses (see Appendix A) for congruence and for acceptance are totalled to get the subscores for each of these conditions. To obtain a total score (that is, a score for the overall conditions of empathy, congruence and acceptance) the three subscores are added together.

Forty-five of the statements measure empathy or the lack of it (see Appendix A). An example of such a statement is as follows: "Even when I cannot say quite what I mean, he knows how I feel." (#31-T)*

Congruence (or lack of it) is measured by fifty-seven of the statements (see Appendix A). An illustration of such a statement is as follows: "I can usually count on him to tell me what he really thinks or feels." (#27-T)*

*The number indicates the position this statement occupies in the first questionnaire; the T or F indicates the keyed response.

The measures of therapeutic conditions derived from the Relationship Questionnaire correlate between .53 and .56 with the ratings made from tape recordings (described later in this section) on clients who were juvenile delinquents. Correlations between the Relationship Questionnaire and measures of outcome for juvenile delinquents are presented in Table III which follows.

The Relationship Questionnaire, which was used in this study to measure the amount of empathy, congruence and acceptance perceived by counselees in their counsellors, was constructed by Charles B. Truax (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). In constructing the questionnaire, he followed closely the thinking and earlier work of Barrett-Lennard (1962) in the latter's development of the relationship inventory (see Appendix B). Barrett-Lennard (1962) was the first to use a questionnaire to measure the counsellee's perception of psychological conditions offered by his counsellor.

In the Relationship Questionnaire, Truax attempted to translate scales which he had previously constructed for rating objective tape recordings of counsellor-counsellee interviews into a form that could be answered by the counsellee. The three scales which he had previously constructed for rating objective tape recordings were developed to "provide a crude but beginning operational definition of accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth (acceptance) and genuineness (congruence)," (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, p. 44). The scales can be found in Truax and Carkhuff (1967, p. 46-72).

These rating scales were based on Truax's definitions of empathy, congruence and acceptance; he derived his definitions of empathy, congruence and acceptance from Carl Rogers' (1957) definitions of these conditions.

TABLE III
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE AND
MEASURES OF OUTCOME FOR JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

	Accurate Empathy	Non- possess- ive Warmth	Genuine- ness	Intensity and Intimacy of Inter- personal Contact	Con- crete	Overall Thera- peutic Relation- ship
Number of Days Institutionalized During One-Year Follow-up (N=74)	.06	.07	.08	.10	.08	.08
FOC (N=75)	.38***	.43***	.40***	.42***	.39***	.43***
MCI (N=72)						
FR	.12	.16	.14	.11	.09	.16
SR	.34***	.37***	.34***	.37***	.37***	.37***
ES	.35***	.36***	.34***	.37***	.35***	.38***
C	.11	.15	.08	.07	.06	.14
R	.37***	.41***	.41***	.39***	.40***	.42***
M	.17	.24**	.20*	.20*	.21*	.22*
L	.24**	.29**	.28**	.28**	.29**	.30***
CPC	.42***	.44***	.41***	.43***	.44***	.45***
Q Sort (N=72)						
Self-Adjustment Score	.28**	.36***	.36***	.32***	.25**	.33***
Self-Expert Correlation	.23**	.29**	.29**	.27**	.20*	.27**
Ideal Adjustment Score	.24**	.26**	.28**	.23**	.25**	.25**
Self-Ideal Correlation	.35***	.36***	.38***	.34***	.32***	.36***
Ideal-Expert Correlation	.22*	.28**	.26**	.20*	.21*	.25**
Anxiety Reaction Scale (N=72)						
Factor of Social Self Consciousness	.19	.23**	.15	.21*	.19	.21*
Factor of Internalized Anxiety	.16	.19	.13	.19	.17	.16
Factor of General Anxiety	.21*	.27**	.19	.25**	.22*	.23**
Palo Alto Group Therapy Scales (N=74)	.07	.07	.09	.12	.14	.10

*p<.05, One-tailed test.
**p<.05, Two-tailed test.
***p<.01, Two-tailed test.

According to Truax (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) accurate empathy "involves both the therapist's sensitivity to current feelings and his verbal facility to communicate this understanding in a language attuned to the client's current feelings (p. 46)."

Congruence, in Truax's terms, implies "not only a congruence between the therapist's organismic self and his behavior and self-concept, but also the absence of defensiveness - seeming genuineness." (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, p. 43)

Acceptance implies not only the possession of "unconditionality of positive regard but also the communication of a non-possessive warmth." (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, p. 43)

Approximately twenty-four studies have been carried out to determine the reliabilities of these rating scales for empathy, acceptance and congruence. The range of reliabilities of the rating scale for empathy is from .43 to .95 with a mean of .75. The reliabilities of the rating scale for congruence range from .25 to .95 with a mean of .62. The reliabilities of the rating scale for acceptance range from .48 to .95 with a mean of .71.

In summary, Truax's Relationship Questionnaire was a translation (by himself) of rating scales measuring empathy, congruence and acceptance in counsellors into statements that could be responded to by counsellees. He found that it could be used with juveniles as well as with adults.

Since a questionnaire with these qualifications was necessary for the researcher to determine whether or not trained counsellors were perceived by their counsellees as having more empathy, congruence and acceptance than untrained ones, the Relationship Questionnaire was used in this study.

2. Biographical Information Questionnaire

A biographical questionnaire was designed by the researcher to obtain the following information about the counsellors: the number of years of experience as a counsellor, the number of years of experience as a teacher, the number of degree(s) held, the proportion of time now spent in counselling and the number of courses in counselling taken at the graduate level. This information was necessary to determine the effect, if any, of these variables on the amount of empathy, congruence and acceptance perceived by the subjects in their counsellors. This questionnaire is shown in Appendix C.

3. Occupational Status

Some studies (Patterson, 1959) have demonstrated that counsellors are more effective with and get along better with middle class counsellees than with either upper or lower class counsellees. The implication of these studies appears to be that counsellees from different socio-economic levels perceive counsellors differentially. For this reason socio-economic status was controlled for in this study.

The Pineo-Porter Occupational Scale (see Appendix D) was used in this study to determine the occupational status of the counsellees in the sample. This was necessary in order to determine whether or not the trained counsellor group and the untrained counsellor group were similar in terms of socio-economic level.

In the Pineo-Porter Occupational Scale there are one hundred and ninety-six titles. Each title is assigned a number, ranging from 14.8 for a garbage collector to 89.9 for a Provincial Premier with a mean of approximately forty-six and a standard deviation of 8.7. Blishen (1958), who also

constructed an occupational status scale for Canada, used a similar technique in his scale. The numbers assigned to each title in his scale ranged from thirty-two to ninety with a mean of approximately fifty and a standard deviation of ten. The Pineo-Porter Scale and Blishen scale have over seventy-seven titles in common. Empirical justification for use of the Pineo-Porter Occupational Scale is seen in the correlation of .88 between this scale and Blishen's scale, which was based on the 1951 census.

The Pineo-Porter Occupational Scale was derived in the following way: in 1962, the National Opinions Research Centre (U.S.A.) undertook a study in which a national sample of adults ranked 200 occupations. In 1965, Pineo and Porter, at Carleton University, replicated this study in Canada. The research design which they adopted required all respondents to rank two hundred and four occupational titles. Since other elements enter into a person's status, sub-samples of respondents were required to rank seventy-two industries and corporations, thirty-six ethnic groups and twenty-one religions. The design also called for sub-samples to rate occupations along such non-prestige dimensions as the most or least desirable, the most or least interesting, the number of people the job affects, the freedom and independence of the job, the perceived income, skills, the benefit to society, and whether the job was hard or easy. This was done by the interview technique. As well as these ranking tasks, the interviewer elicited social background characteristics of the respondents, their spouses, their parents and information relating to work experience, mobility, attitudes to education and inter-ethnic relations.

Changes were made in the occupational titles to make them representative of the Canadian labour force. They ended up with one hundred and

seventy-two titles common to both the United States and Canadian studies.

Their sample was sufficiently representative of the country on the following variables: province, religious affiliation, occupation, mother tongue, sex, and country of birth. Of these, two were in fact variables upon which the sample was built - province and sex - so that consistency with the census was somewhat guaranteed for them.

III. DATA COLLECTION

In October 1967, a letter (see Appendix F), explaining the nature of the study, was sent to the principal and the counsellor of each of the chosen schools. Each counsellor was asked (in the letter) to keep a record of the students counselled (by him or her only) at least twice between September 1967, and the middle of January 1968. The counsellors replied to the researcher by telephone. All but one agreed to cooperate. Another school and counsellor were then chosen to replace the one which refused to cooperate. The newly chosen counsellor was contacted and he agreed to cooperate. Further explanation was given to each counsellor by the researcher by means of telephone.

Around the middle of January 1968, a list of qualifying counsellees (subjects) was mailed to the writer by each of the fourteen counsellors. They were asked to do this by the researcher who contacted each of them by telephone during the early part of January 1968. The breakdown of the number of counsellees for each trained counsellor is as follows: eighteen, thirteen, thirteen, fifteen, twenty, nineteen and twelve. The breakdown of the number of counsellees for each untrained counsellor is as follows:

twelve, eleven, fifteen, sixteen, fifteen, twelve and nine.

During the last three days of January 1968, each school was visited by the researcher. In each school, the Relationship Questionnaire was administered in a group session to all the subjects. Instructions to the students were those found on the first part of the questionnaire (see Appendix E).

Each of the counsellors was asked to complete the Biographical Information Questionnaire while the subjects were responding to the Relationship Questionnaire.

IV. A SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH DESIGN

In this study the subjects were asked to complete a questionnaire which would show how much empathy, congruence and acceptance they perceived in their counsellors. The instrument used was the Relationship Questionnaire, the details of which are described in the section on instrumentation. The two hundred subjects who completed the questionnaire were counsellees in grades seven, eight and nine who had been interviewed by their counsellor at least twice between September 1967, and January 1968. They were the counsellees of fourteen counsellors chosen from fourteen schools in the city of Edmonton and district.

The data collected from the Relationship Questionnaire and from the Biographical Information Questionnaire were analyzed by analysis of covariance, with the covariate being occupational status.

CHAPTER IV

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

I. INTRODUCTION

The results of the study are presented as follows: First the means and standard deviations of the two groups on empathy, congruence, acceptance and total scores are given. Secondly, the results of the analysis of covariance are presented. Third, the findings regarding the effects of the variables are given. Finally, a summary of the conclusions is stated.

II. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF EMPATHY, CONGRUENCE, ACCEPTANCE, AND TOTAL SCORES

The means and standard deviations of the two groups on the empathy, congruence, acceptance and total scores were calculated for the trained counsellor group and the untrained counsellor group.

TABLE IV

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE TRAINED
COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED
COUNSELLOR GROUP ON THE
EMPATHY SCORES

Group	Number	M	Adj. M.	S.D.
Trained	110	27.099	27.087	9.067
Untrained	90	25.355	25.370	10.108
Difference		1.744	1.717	

TABLE V

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR
GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP ON THE
CONGRUENCE SCORES

Group	Number	M	Adj. M.	S.D.
Trained	110	36.181	36.167	9.719
Untrained	90	34.400	34.418	11.012
Difference		1.781	1.749	

TABLE VI

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR
GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP ON THE
ACCEPTANCE SCORES

Group	Number	M	Adj. M.	S.D.
Trained	110	49.864	49.893	12.091
Untrained	90	46.056	46.020	15.482
Difference		3.808	3.873	

TABLE VII

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR
AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP ON THE TOTAL
(EMPATHY AND CONGRUENCE AND ACCEPTANCE) SCORES

Group	Number	M	Adj. M.	S.D.
Trained	110	113.236	113.248	29.618
Untrained	90	105.567	105.553	35.331
Difference		7.669	7.695	

In all four of these cases, the means of the scores for the trained counsellor group tend to be higher than those of the scores for the untrained counsellor group, thus, indicating a trend in favor of the trained counsellor group.

Furthermore, the standard deviations for the untrained counsellor group tend to be larger than those for the trained counsellor group.

III. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE AND FINDINGS

Following the calculation of the means and standard deviations of the trained counsellor group and the untrained counsellor group on empathy, congruence, acceptance scores and total scores, analyses of covariance were performed. This comparison between the trained counsellor and the untrained counsellor groups was expressed in the form of the significance of the difference between adjusted empathy means, adjusted congruence means, adjusted acceptance means and adjusted means for overall conditions. The covariate in all four cases was socio-economic status. The analysis of covariance for empathy is presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED EMPATHY MEANS FOR THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between Groups	1	145.426	1.588	.209
Within Groups	197	91.590		

It is obvious from even a cursory inspection of Table IV that the difference between the trained counsellor group mean and the untrained counsellor group mean for empathy is not significant. The adjusted F of 1.588 and the probability of .209 in Table VIII lend support to this. It must therefore be noted that the data available do not lend support to Hypothesis I.

The analysis of covariance for congruence is presented in Table IX.

TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED CONGRUENCE
MEANS FOR THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP
AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between Groups	1	150.758	1.409	.236
Within Groups	197	106.961		

An inspection of Table V reveals that the difference between the trained counsellor group mean and the untrained counsellor group mean for congruence is not significant. The adjusted F of 1.409 and the probability of .236 in Table IX lend support to this. Therefore, the available data do not lend support to Hypothesis II.

The analysis of covariance for acceptance is presented in Table X.

TABLE X

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED ACCEPTANCE
MEANS FOR THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP
AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP

Source Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between Groups	1	739.813	3.918	.05*
Within Groups	197	188.822		

Table VI reveals that the difference between the trained counsellor group mean and the untrained counsellor group mean for acceptance is significant. The adjusted F of 3.918 and the probability of .05 in Table X lend support to this statement. Therefore, the available data do support Hypothesis III.

The analysis of covariance for the scores for the overall conditions is presented in Table XI.

TABLE XI

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON THE ADJUSTED TOTAL
MEANS FOR THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP
AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between Groups	1	2921.625	2.784	.10
Within Groups	197	1049.266		

*This is significant because the probability level adopted in this study is .05.

Table VII reveals that the difference between the trained counsellor group mean and the untrained counsellor group mean for the scores of the overall conditions is not significant. The adjusted F of 2.784 ($p < .10$) attests to this statement. Therefore, the available data do not lend support to Hypothesis IV.

IV. THE VARIABLES

An analysis of covariance was done to determine the effect, if any, of the number of years of counselling experience, of the proportion of time spent in counselling, of the number of years of teaching experience, of the number of degrees held and of the number of courses in counselling taken at the graduate level on the amount of empathy, congruence and acceptance the counsellees perceived in their counsellors. The information required to determine the effect of these variables was obtained from the Biographical Information Questionnaire which was completed by each of the fourteen counsellors.

The following table shows the number of years of counselling experience that each counsellor had.

TABLE XII

NUMBER OF YEARS OF COUNSELLING EXPERIENCE

Years of Counselling Experience	Number of Counsellors
0	1
1	1
2	3
3	3
4	3
5	1
6	1
9	1

For the variable amount of time now spent in counselling, there were four groups. Six were full-time counsellors, while three spent two-thirds of their time counselling. Two spent half-time counselling and three spent less than half-time counselling. Those who were not full-time counsellors spent the remainder of their time teaching subjects.

All but one of the counsellors had some teaching experience. The following table shows the number of years of teaching experience each counsellor had.

TABLE XIII
NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Years of Teaching Experience	Number of Counsellors
0	1
3	1
4	2
6	1
7	2
8	2
11	1
13	1
20	1
26	1
44	1

Nine of the counsellors held undergraduate degrees only, three counsellors held both an undergraduate degree and a graduate degree in counselling (or a diploma in counselling). Two of the counsellors held no degree.

The following table shows the number of courses in counselling

taken at the graduate level by each counsellor.

TABLE XIV
NUMBER OF COURSES IN COUNSELLING
TAKEN AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL

Number of Courses Taken at the Graduate Level	Number of Counsellors
0	6 (untrained)
1	1 (untrained)
3	1 (trained)
4	3 (trained)
5	2 (trained)
6	1 (trained)

In each case an analysis of covariance was used to determine the effect, if any, of each of these variables on the amount of empathy, congruence and acceptance perceived by the counsellees in their counsellors. In all cases the covariate was occupational status.

Results (see Appendix G) indicate that the number of years of counselling experience, the proportion of time now spent in counselling, the number of years of teaching experience, the number of degrees held and the number of courses in counselling taken at the graduate level have no significant effect on the amount of empathy, congruence and acceptance perceived by the counsellees in their counsellors.

The results show that these variables could have been omitted from the statistical design as they seem to have no significant effect on the amount of empathy, congruence and acceptance perceived by the counsellees in their counsellors.

V. CONCLUSIONS

1. Hypothesis I

Trained counsellors are not perceived by their counsellees as being more empathic than are untrained ones.

2. Hypothesis II

Trained counsellors are not perceived by their counsellees as being more congruent than are untrained ones.

3. Hypothesis III

The counsellees of trained counsellors perceive their counsellors as being significantly more accepting than are untrained ones.
($p < .05$)

4. Hypothesis IV

Trained counsellors are not perceived by their counsellees as providing more of an overall therapeutic relationship (empathy + congruence + acceptance = combined total) than are untrained ones.

5. Findings Regarding the Variables

The number of years of counselling experience, the proportion of time now spent in counselling, the number of years of teaching experience, the number of degrees held and the number of courses in counselling taken at the graduate level have no significant effect on the amount of empathy, congruence and acceptance perceived by the counsellees in their counsellors.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION

I. Discussion of Findings

Barrett-Lennard (1962), in his study with forty-two clients, with twenty-one different therapists, found that expert therapists (all had completed a two year internship and had been appointed to counselling positions) were perceived by their clients as being more empathic, more congruent and more accepting than were non-expert therapists (these were first year staff interns who had completed a practicum course in client-centered therapy).

In the present investigation, the criteria for trained and untrained counsellors differs from the criteria for expert and non-expert therapists in Barrett-Lennard's study. In the present study, the trained counsellors had to have some courses in counselling at the graduate level and a counselling practicum. The untrained counsellors were teachers who had been assigned counsellor duties for at least half of their time; they had no courses in counselling at the graduate level nor did they have a practicum. In Barrett-Lennard's study, the less expert therapists were first year staff interns, and one nonintern research assistant, who had all completed a preliminary practicum course in client-centered therapy. The more expert group had all completed at least the equivalent of a two-year internship in the Counselling Centre and had been appointed to staff counselling positions in the Centre (University of Chicago). Furthermore, the clients in Barrett-Lennard's study had been interviewed more times by their therapists than were the

counselees in the present investigation. Because of these differences, it may seem unfair to compare the two studies.

However, the two studies do have similarities. In both, the clients or counselees were asked to rate their relationship with their therapists or counsellors. Both studies defined empathy, congruence and acceptance in a similar way.

Despite their differences, the results of Barrett-Lennard's study and the results of the present study were similar for one variable. The present investigation failed to support Barrett-Lennard's finding for empathy and congruence. However, like Barrett-Lennard, the writer found that trained counsellors were perceived by their counselees as being more accepting than were the untrained ones.

Although the trained counsellors were not perceived as being significantly more empathic and congruent than were the untrained ones, there was a trend in favour of the trained group. The means in the following table lend support to this observation.

TABLE XV

MEANS OF EMPATHY, CONGRUENCE, ACCEPTANCE AND
TOTAL SCORES FOR THE TRAINED COUNSELLOR
GROUP AND THE UNTRAINED COUNSELLOR GROUP

Condition	Means	
	Trained	Untrained
Empathy	27.100	25.356
Congruence	36.182	34.400
Acceptance	*49.864	46.056
Overall Conditions	113.236	105.567

*Significant at the .05 level.

One might conjecture that an increase in the number of trained and untrained counsellors and in the number of counselees used in the study might change this trend to a significant difference in favour of the trained counsellor group.

The trained counsellors were perceived to be significantly more accepting than were the untrained counsellors; yet, they were not perceived as being significantly more congruent or more empathic than were the untrained ones. These negative results may be partially explained by the low reliability (.53 to .56) of the main instrument used. Perhaps more reliability studies need to be done for the Relationship Questionnaire.

In Barrett-Lennard's study the length of therapy ranged from seven to ninety-six interviews with a mean of thirty-three. The relationship data were gathered from clients after the first five therapy interviews, after fifteen and after twenty-five interviews (for clients who continued in therapy for the necessary lengths of time), and at termination of therapy.

In the present study, the minimum required number of interviews with each counsellee was two. The researcher wanted the minimum number of interviews to be larger and therefore expressed the following hope in the letter to the counsellors: "that by January 1968, there will be a good number of counselees who will have been interviewed a few times (4, 5, or 6 times)." The counsellors were also asked to keep a record of the number of times each counsellee in the study was interviewed between September 1967 and January 1968. Some of the counsellors, however, failed to keep this record. As a result, data for the number of interviews were not available for this present study. Had such data been available, length

of counselling could have been another variable considered.

The minimum number of interviews in the present study is less than that in Barrett-Lennard's study; data concerning the number of interviews each subject had are not available. Therefore, the minimum, the maximum and the mean number of interviews are not known. This may partially account for the reason why Hypotheses I, II and IV were not upheld.

Since data concerning the minimum and maximum number of interviews are not available, it is not known whether or not the trained counsellors interviewed their counsellees more times than did the untrained counsellors. Therefore, it is possible that the untrained counsellors accepted the challenge (regarding number of interviews) put forth in the letter to the counsellors and hence had more interviews (than did the trained counsellors with their counsellees) with the counsellees whom they recommended as subjects for the present study. If the untrained counsellors did have more interviews with their counsellees, then the counsellees would have had more opportunity to perceive empathy, congruence and acceptance or the lack of them in their counsellors. On the other hand, if the trained counsellors had fewer interviews with their counsellees, then the counsellees would have had less opportunity to perceive empathy, congruence and acceptance in their counsellors. This could partially explain why Hypothesis III was supported (the counsellees of the untrained counsellors would have had more opportunity to perceive lack of acceptance in their counsellors); it could partially account for the negative results, too.

Still another reason could partially account for the negative results. Some of the counsellors were in the particular school since

September 1967 only. Therefore, some of the counselees had had other counsellors in the previous years in junior high school. Attitudes regarding their relationships with previous counsellors may have affected their attitudes toward the present counsellors, thus contaminating the results. This could be more possible if the subjects had more interviews with their previous counsellor than they had with their present counsellor.

II. IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNSELLING

1. To evaluate the effectiveness of a training program (Truax, Carkhuff and Douds, 1964), using an integrated, didactic and experiential approach, Carkhuff and Truax (1965) compared the post-training levels of empathy, congruence and acceptance in a group of clinical psychology trainees and a group of lay persons with the levels of therapeutic conditions provided by a group of experienced and highly skilled therapists. The lay people were psychiatric aides in a hospital setting; they had been recommended for the training. They were trained within a program built systematically around the core conditions of empathy, congruence and acceptance.

The findings indicated that the levels of empathy and acceptance post-training for the lay group did not differ significantly from that of the group of experienced therapists. The experienced therapists, however, showed a significantly higher level of genuineness (congruence) in comparison to the lay trainees. The differences, while statistically significant, were not large. In another training process study, using a control group (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, p. 109), the trainees, in relatively brief periods of time, demonstrated significant improvement and high levels of

functioning on the therapeutic dimensions of empathy, congruence and acceptance. The control group demonstrated minimal change.

In the present study, the trained counsellors were not perceived as being any more empathic or congruent than were the untrained ones. These trained counsellors were not selected or screened for the training they received. Nor were they trained within a program built systematically around the core conditions of empathy, congruence and acceptance (as was the situation in the case of the lay persons in Truax and Carkhuff's study).

The results of Carkhuff and Truax's (1965) study plus the facts stated in the previous paragraph would indicate a need to re-examine our graduate training programs in counselling. Perhaps the entrants into such a program need to be selected on the basis of certain specified criteria. Too, it may be that the counsellor training program needs to focus more on the core conditions of empathy, congruence and acceptance, perhaps, using an integrated, didactic and experiential approach (see Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, p. 240-284).

2. On the basis of previous research and on the basis of the findings in the present study, it would seem that certain personality factors possibly play a role in the communication of empathy, congruence and acceptance. Some teachers, who have part-time counselling duties, may be more inclined toward an "understanding" approach to students. Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) found that it is typical of those students interested in careers in the helping profession to be quite empathic, congruent and accepting upon entering training.

On this basis, the Relationship Questionnaire could be administered to the counselees of all untrained counsellors in a school system. Scales (such as the ones constructed by Truax and Carkhuff, 1967, p. 46-72) measuring empathy, congruence and acceptance, could be administered to the untrained counsellors. The untrained counsellors who scored high on both kinds of scales could be encouraged to enter a training program built systematically around the core conditions of empathy, congruence and acceptance.

Implications for Further Research

1. In Barrett-Lennard's study, in which the expert therapists were perceived by their clients as being more empathic, more congruent and more accepting than were the non-expert therapists, the length of therapy ranged from seven to ninety-six interviews with a mean of thirty-three. In this study, the minimum number of interviews with the counselees was two. As a result, some of the counselees may not have had enough time to perceive empathy, congruence and acceptance in their counsellors. Therefore, a study similar to the present one should be carried out, increasing the minimum required number of interviews.
2. The negative findings could partially be accounted for by the fact that some of the counselees could have responded to the Relationship Questionnaire on the basis of the relationship they had with a different counsellor the previous year. This could have easily happened since some of the counsellors were in the particular school since September, 1967 only. To avoid this, a study, similar to the present one, could be carried out in a situation where the counselees have had the same counsellor

throughout the junior high school years or for at least two years.

3. An investigation of the literature revealed that the Relationship Questionnaire is one of the few instruments which can be administered to counselees to determine whether or not they perceive their counsellors as being empathic, congruent and accepting. Even though it has low reliability researchers still have to use it.

The researcher (in this study) tried to construct an instrument similar to the Relationship Questionnaire but encountered difficulties when trying to validate it. As a result, the Relationship Questionnaire was used in this study.

Since researchers have to use it and since its low reliability could contribute to negative results in a study, it would seem fitting that research attempting to increase the reliability of this instrument should be carried out. This research could take the form of a factor analysis study or a study in which the number of items in the questionnaire is increased.

4. The trained counsellors were perceived as being significantly more accepting than were the untrained ones. However, the trained counsellors were not perceived as being significantly more empathic and congruent than were the untrained ones. Yet, there was a trend in favour of the trained group (see Table XV). One might conjecture that an increase in the number of trained and untrained counsellors and in the number of counselees used in this study might change this trend to a significant difference in favour of the trained counsellor group. Therefore, a study similar to this one should be carried out increasing the number of participating counsellors and counselees.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Alexander, F. Fundamentals of Psychoanalysis. New York: Norton, 1948.
- Arbuckle, D. Client Perception of Counsellor Personality. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1956, 3, 92-96.
- Barrett-Lennard, G.T. Dimensions of Therapist Response as Causal Factors in Therapeutic Change. Psychological Monograph 76, (Whole 562), 1962.
- Barrett-Lennard, G.T. Dimensions of the Client's Experience of his Therapist Associated with Personality Change. Genetic Psychol., Monograph, 1962, 76, 43.
- Berdie, R.F. A Program of Counseling Interview Research. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1958, 18, 255-274.
- Blishen, B.R. The Construction and Use of an Occupational Class Scale. Canadian Journal of Economical and Political Science, 1958, 24, 519-531.
- Blum, Milton & Benjamin Balinsky. Counselling and Psychology. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1951.
- Bohn, M.J., Jr. Counsellor Behavior as a Function of Counsellor Dominance, Counsellor Experience and Client Type. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1965, 12 (4), 346-52.
- Broedel, J., Ohlsen, M., Proff, F., & Southard, C. The Effects of Group Counselling on Gifted Underachieving Adolescents. Journal Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 163-170.
- Brough, J.R. Sources of Student Perceptions of the Role of the Counsellor. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 43 (6), 597-599.
- Caplan, S.W. The Effect of Group Counselling in Junior High School Boys' Concepts of Themselves in School. Journal Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 124-128.
- Caravelle, S.J. Effectiveness of High School Guidance Services. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1958, 36, 323-325.
- Carkhuff, R.R. Differential Functioning of Lay and Professional Helpers. Journal Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 2, 117-126.
- Carkhuff, R.R., Kratochvil, D., and Friel, T. Effects of Professional Training in Communication and Discrimination of Facilitative Conditions. Journal Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 1, 68-74.
- Carkhuff, R.R. and Truax, C.B. Training in Counselling and Psychotherapy: An Evaluation of an Integrated Didactic and Experiential Approach. Journal Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 333 (a).

- Carlin, L.D. Negative Responses to Counselling. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1965, 13, 4, 287-289.
- Chase, W.P. Measurement of Attitude Toward Counselling. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1946, 6, 467-473.
- Combs, A.W. and Soper, D.W. The Perceptual Organization of Effective Counsellors. Journal Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 222.
- Cottle, W.C. Personality Characteristics of Counsellors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1953, 31, 445-453.
- Dispenzieri, A. and Balinsky, B. Relationship Between the Ability to Acquire Interviewing Skills and Authoritarianism and Manifest Anxiety. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, Sept., 42, 40-42.
- Dymond, R. A Scale for the Measurement of Empathic Ability. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 127-233.
- Elley, W.B. A Comparative Analysis of the Socio-economic Bias in Selected Intelligence Tests. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1961.
- Ends, F.J. and Page, C.W. A Study of Three Types of Group Psychotherapy with Hospitalized Male Patients. Quarterly Journal for Studies in Alcoholism, 1957, 18, 263-277.
- Ferenczi, S. The Principle of Relaxation and Neocatharsis. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1930, 11, 428-433.
- Fiedler, F.E. The Concept of an Ideal Therapeutic Relationship. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 239-245.
- Form, A.L. Measurement of Student Attitudes Toward Counselling Services. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1953, Oct., 32, 84-87.
- Grigg, A.E. Client Response to Counsellors at Different Levels of Experience. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 217-233.
- Grigg, A., et. al. Use of Clients as Judges of the Counsellor's Performance. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 31-36.
- Halkides, G. An Investigation of Therapeutic Success as a Function of Four Variables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.
- Heine, R.W. A Comparison of Patients' Report on Psychotherapeutic Experience with Psychoanalytic, non-Directive, and Adlerian Therapists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950.

- Jourard, S. and I. Thou. Relationship versus Manipulation in Counselling and Psychotherapy. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 1959, 13, 174.
- Jaques, M.E. *Critical Counseling Behavior in Rehabilitation Settings*. Iowa City: College of Education, State University of Iowa, 1960.
- Jensen, R.E. Student Feeling about Counselling Help. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1954, 33, 498-503.
- Kaess, W. and Long, L. An Investigation of the Effectiveness of Vocational Guidance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1954, 14, 423-433.
- Kelz, J.W. The Development and Evaluation of a Measure of Counselor Effectiveness. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1966, 44 (5), 511-516.
- Kemp, C.G. Influence of Dogmatism on Training of Counsellors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1962, 9, 2, 155-157.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Kirk, B.A. Counselling Phi Beta Kappas. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1955, 2, 304-307.
- Lorimer, M. An Appraisal of Vocational Guidance. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1944, 15, 260-267.
- Martison, W.D. Utilization of the Role Construct Repertory Test in the Counselling Process. *Dissertation Abstract*, 1955, 15, 2102-2103.
- McLaughlin, E.G. A Study of the Effectiveness of Personal Counselling with Seventh Grade Pupils. *Dissertation Abstract*, 1956, 16, 2089.
- Mills, D.H. and Abeles N. Counsellor Needs for Affiliation and Nurturance as Related to Liking for Clients and Counselling Process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1965, 12, 4, 353-358.
- Menzer, P., et. al. Guidance Institutes and the Persistence of Attitudes: A Progress Report. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1963, 41, 5, 415-419.
- Munger, P.F. and Johnson, C.A. Changes in Attitudes Associated with an N.D.E.A. Counselling and Guidance Institute. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1960, 38, 751-753.
- Munger, P.F., Myers, R.A. and Brown, D.F. Guidance Institutes and the Persistence of Attitudes: A Progress Report. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1963, 41, 5, 415-419.

- National Vocational Guidance Association. Counsellor Preparation. Washington, D.C., 1949.
- Pineo, P.C. and Porter, T. A Measure of Occupational Prestige, 1965. Paper Presented at the Meeting of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association. See Appendix D.
- Pohlman, E. and Robinson, F.P. Client Reaction to Some Aspect of the Counselling Situation. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1960, 38, 546-551.
- Quinn, R.D. Psychotherapists' Expressions as an Index to the Quality of Early Therapeutic Relationships. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950.
- Rausch, H.L. and Bordin, E.S. Warmth in Personality Development and in Psychotherapy. Psychiatry, 1957, 20, 4, 351-363.
- Reeves, M.E. and Arbuckle, D. The Counselling Attitudes of Deans of Women. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 41, 438-441.
- Rogers, C.R. Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Changes. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 95-103.
- Rogers, C.R. The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1958, 37, 6-16.
- Rothney, J.W.M. Guidance Practises and Results. New York: Harper, 1958.
- Schmidt, L.D. and Pepinsky, H.B. Counselling Research in 1963. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1965, 19, 4, 418-427.
- Shultz, Merlin W. Student Opinions of a High School Guidance Program. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 41, 709-715.
- Seeman, J. Counsellor Judgements of Therapeutic Process and Outcome. In Rogers, C.R. & Dymond, R.F. (Eds.), Psychotherapy and Personality. Changes, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954, 7.
- Snyder, W.V. The Psychotherapeutic Relationship. New York: McMillan, 1961.
- Spotts, J. The Perception of Positive Regard by Relatively Successful and Relatively Unsuccessful Clients. Brief Research Reports, Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 15, 1962.

- Stewart, L.H. Teachers and Counsellors Look at Students: Some Implications for Guidance Practices. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1957, 35, 565-68.
- Strunk, O., Jr. Empathy: A Review of Theory and Research. *Psychology Newsletter*, 1957, 9, 47-57.
- Strupp, H.H. The Nature of the Psychotherapist Contribution to the Treatment Process. *Journal of General Psychiatry*, 1960, 3, 219-231.
- Thompson, A.S. and Super, D.S. (Eds.), *The Professional Preparation of Counselling Psychologists. Report of 1964 Greystone Conference.* New York: Bureau of Publication - Teachers' College, Columbus, 1964.
- Truax, C.B. and Carkhuff, R.R. *Toward Effective Counselling and Psychotherapy: Training and Practice: Maria, Alex (Ed.),* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.
- Truax, C.B., Carkhuff, R.R. and Douds, J. Toward an Integration of the Didactic and Experiential Approaches to Training in Counselling and Psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1964, 3, 240.
- Truax, C.B. and Silber, L.D. *Personality and Psychotherapeutic Skills.* Unpublished Manuscript, University of Arkansas, 1966.
- Tyler, L.E. *The Work of the Counsellor.* New York: Appleton-Century Crafts, Inc., 1953.
- Whistone, B.D. Personality Differences between Selected Counsellors and Effective Teachers. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1955, 43, 9, 886-890.
- Williamson, E.G. and Bordin, E.S. Evaluating Counselling by Means of a Control Group Experience. *School and Society*, 1940, 52, 434-440.
- Winkler, R.C., Munger, P.R., Girst, C.J., Teigland, J.J. Changes in Concepts of Self and Others of N.D.E.A. Guidance Institute Members. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1963, 10, (3) 227-231.
- Worbois, G.M. Effect of Guidance Program on Emotional Development. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1947, 31, 169-181.
- Wrenn, R.L. Counselor Orientation: Theoretical or Situational. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1960, 7, 40-45.

Appendix A

RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE (AND SCORING KEY)¹

People feel differently about some people than they do about others. There are a number of statements below that describe a variety of ways that one person may feel about another person, or ways that one person may act toward another person. Consider each statement carefully and decide whether it is true or false when applied to your present relationship with your instructor. If the statement seems to be mostly true, then mark it true; if it is mostly not true, then mark it false.

	Accurate Empathy	Nonpossessive Warmth	Genuineness	Overall Therapeutic relationship	Intensity & Intimacy of interpersonal contact.	Concreteness
1. He seems to hold things back rather than tell me what he really thinks.			f	f	f	f
2. He understands my words but does not know I feel.	f			f		f
3. He understands me.	t			t		
4. He understands exactly how I see things.	t			t	t	t
5. He is often disappointed in me.		f	t	f		
6. He seems to like me no matter what I say to him.		t	t	t	t	
7. He is impatient with me.		f	t	f		
8. He may understand me but he does not know how I feel.	f			f		f
9. Sometimes he seems interested in me while other times he does not seem to care about me.		f		f	f	
10. He often misunderstands what I am trying to say.	f			f		f
11. He almost always seems very concerned about me.	t			t	t	
12. Sometimes I feel that what he says to me is very different from the way he really feels.			f	f		
13. He is a person you can really trust.	t		t	t		
14. Sometimes he will argue with me just to prove he is right.	f		f	f	f	
15. Sometimes he seems to be uncomfortable with me, but we go on and pay no attention to it.		f	f	f		f
16. Some things I say seem to upset him.		f	t	f		
17. He can read me like a book.	t			t		t
18. He usually is not very interested in what I have to say.		f		f	f	
19. He feels indifferent about me.		f		f	f	
20. He acts too professional.			f	f	f	

¹ Scale developed by Charles B. Truax during 1963. It is an attempt to translate the previous scales used for ratings objective tape recordings into a questionnaire form that can be answered by the client. In this respect it follows closely the thinking and earlier work of Barrett-Lennard in his development of the relationship inventory.

	Accurate Empathy	Non possessive Warmth	Genuineness	Overall Therapeutic Relationship	Intensity & Intimacy of Interpersonal Contact	Concreteness
21. I am just another student to him.			f	f	f	
22. I feel that I can trust him to be honest with me.	f	t f	t	t f	f	t f
23. He ignores some of my feelings.		t		t		
24. He likes to see me.	t			t		t
25. He knows more about me than I do about myself.	t			t		t
26. Sometimes he is so much "with me" in my feelings, that I am not at all distracted by his presence.	t	t	t	t	t	t
27. I can usually count on him to tell me what he really thinks or feels.			t	t		t
28. He appreciates me.		t		t	t	
29. He sure makes me think hard about myself.				t		t
30. I feel that he is being genuine with me.			t	t		
31. Even when I cannot say quite what I mean, he knows how I feel.	t			t	t	
32. He usually helps me to know how I am feeling by putting my feelings into words for me.	t			t	t	t
33. He seems like a very cold person.		f	f	f	f	
34. He must understand me, but I often think he is wrong.	f			f		f
35. I feel that he really thinks I am worthwhile.		t		t	t	
36. Even if I were to criticize him, he would still like me.		t	t	t	t	
37. He likes me better when I agree with him.		f	t	f		
38. He seems to follow almost every feeling I have while I am with him.	t			t	t	t
39. He usually uses just the right words when he tries to understand how I am feeling.	t			t		t
40. If it were not for him I would probably never be forced to think about some of the things that trouble me.				t		t
41. He pretends that he likes me more than he really does.			f	f		
42. He really listens to everything I say.		t		t	t	
43. Sometimes he seems to be putting up a professional front.			f	f	f	
44. Sometimes he is so much "with me" that with only the slightest hint he is able to accurately sense some of my deepest feelings.	t	t		t	t	t
45. I feel safer with him than I do with almost any other person.		t	t	t		

	Accurate Empathy	Nonpossessive Warmth	Genuineness	Overall Therapeutic Relationship Intensity & Intimacy of Interpersonal Contact	Concreteness
46. His voice usually sounds very serious.				t	t
47. I often cannot understand what he is trying to tell me.	f			f	f
48. Sometimes he sort of "pulls back" and examines me.			f	f	f
49. I am afraid of him.		f		f	
50. He seems to pressure me to talk about things that are important to me.				t	t
51. Whatever he says usually fits right in with what I am feeling.	t			t	t
52. He sometimes seems more interested in what he himself says than in what I say.	f	f	t	f	f
53. He tells me things that he does not mean.			f	f	
54. He often does not seem to be genuinely himself.			f	f	
55. He is a very sincere person.			t	t	
56. With him I feel more free to really be myself than with almost anyone else I know.		t		t	
57. He sometimes pretends to understand me, when he really does not.	f		f	f	f
58. He usually knows exactly what I mean, sometimes even before I finish saying it.	t			t	t
59. He accepts me the way I am even though he wants me to be better.		t	t	t	t
60. Whether I am talking about "good" or "bad" feelings seems to make no real difference in the way he feels toward me.		t		t	
61. In many of our talks I feel that he pushes me to talk about things that are upsetting.				t	t
62. He often leads me into talking about some of my deepest feelings.	t			t	t
63. He usually makes me work hard at knowing myself.				t	t
64. Sometimes I feel like going to sleep while I am talking with him.				f	f
65. He is curious about what makes me act like I do, but he is not really interested in me.		f		f	f
66. He sometimes completely understands me so that he knows what I am feeling even when I am hiding my feelings.	t			t	t
67. I sometimes feel safe enough with him to really say how I feel.		t	t	t	
68. I feel I can trust him more than anyone else I know.		t	t	t	

	Accurate Empathy	Nonpossessive Warmth	Genuineness	Overall Therapeutic Relationship Intensity & Intimacy of Interpersonal Contact	Concreteness
69. Whatever I talk about is okay with him.		t		t	
70. He helps me know myself better by sometimes pointing to feelings within me that I had been unaware of.	t			t	t
71. He seems like a real person, instead of just a teacher.			t	t	
72. I can learn a lot about myself from talking with him.	t			t	t
73. In spite of all he knows about me, he seems to trust my feelings about what is right and wrong for me.		t		t	t
74. Sometimes he is upset when I see him but he tries to hide it.			f	f	
75. He would never knowingly hurt me.		t		t	
76. He is a phony.			f	f	
77. He is the kind of person who might lie to me if he thought it would help me.		f	f	f	
78. When he sees me he seems to be "just doing a job".	f	f	f	f	f
79. In spite of the bad things that he knows about me, he seems to still like me.		t	t		
80. I sometimes get the feeling that for him the most important thing is that I should really like him.		f		f	f
81. There is something about the way he reacts to what I tell him that makes me uncertain whether he can keep my confidences to himself.			f	f	
82. He gives me so much advice I sometimes think he is trying to live my life for me.		f		f	
83. He never knows when to stop talking about something which is not very meaningful to me.	f	f		f	f
84. He sometimes cuts me off abruptly just when I am leading up to something very important to me.	f	f		f	f
85. He frequently acts so restless that I get the feeling he can hardly wait for the day to end.		f		f	f
86. There are lots of things I could tell him, but I am not sure how he would react to them, so I keep them to myself.	f	f		f	
87. He constantly reminds me that we are friends though I have a feeling that he drags this into the conversation.	f	f		f	
88. He sometimes tries to make a joke out of something I feel really upset about.	f	f			f
89. He is sometimes so rude I only accept it because he is supposed to be helping me.		f		f	f

	Accurate Empathy	Non possessive Warmth	Genuineness	Overall Therapeutic Relationship Intensity & Intimacy of Interpersonal Contact Concreteness
90. Sometimes he seems to be playing "cat and mouse" with me.		f	f	f f
91. He often points out what a lot of help he is giving me even though it does not feel like it to me.	f	f		f f
92. It is hard to feel comfortable with him because he sometimes seems to be trying out some new theory on me.		f	f	f
93. He's got a job to do and does it. That's the only reason he does not tell me off.		f	f	f
94. If I had a chance to study under a different instructor, I would.	f			f f
95. He is always relaxed, I don't think anything could get him excited.			f	f f
96. I don't think he has ever smiled.		f		f
97. He is always the same.		f		t
98. I would like to be like him.		t		t
99. He makes me feel like a guinea pig or some kind of animal.			f	f
100. He uses the same words over and over again till I'm bored.				
101. Usually I can lie to him and he never knows the difference.	f			f
102. He may like me, but he does not like the things I talk about.		f		f
103. I don't think he really cares if I live or die.		f	f	f f
104. He does not like me as a person, but continues to see me as a student anyway.		f	f	f
105. I think he is dumb.	f			f
106. He never says anything that makes him sound like a real person.			f	f f f f
107. He is all right, but I really don't trust him.			f	f
108. If I make mistakes or miss a class, he really gives me trouble about it.		f		f
109. He lets me talk about anything.		t		t
110. He probably laughs about the things that I have said to him.	f		f	f
111. I don't think he knows what is the matter with me.	f			f f
112. He sometimes looks as worried as I feel.			t	t
113. He is really a cold fish.		f	f	f f
114. There are times when I don't have to speak, he knows how I feel.	t			t
115. If I am happy or if I am sad, it makes no difference he is always the same.		t		t

	Accurate Empathy	Nonpossessive Warmth	Genuineness	Overall Therapeutic Relationship Intensity & Intimacy of Interpersonal Contact	Concreteness
116. He really wants to understand me, I can tell by the way he acts.				t	t
117. He knows what it feels like to be ill.	t			t	
118. He must think he is God, the way he talks about things.		f	f	f	
119. He really wants to understand me, I can tell by the way he asks questions.				t	t
120. He must think that he is God, the way he treats me.		f		f	
121. He rarely makes me talk about anything that would be uncomfortable.				f	f
122. He interrupts me whenever I am talking about something that really means a lot to me.	f			f	
123. When I'm talking about things that mean a great deal to me, he acts like they don't mean a thing.		f		f	
124. I can tell by his expressions sometimes that he says things that he does not mean.			f	f	
125. He really wants me to act a certain way, and says so.					
126. There are a lot of things that I would like to talk about, but he won't let me.		f		f	
127. He really likes me and shows it.		t	t	t	t
128. I think he could like someone, but I don't think he could love anybody.		f		f	
129. There are times when he is silent for long periods and then says things that don't have much to do with what we have been talking about.	f	f		f	f
130. When he is wrong he doesn't try to hide it.			t	t	
131. He acts like he knows it all.		f		f	
132. If he had his way, he wouldn't walk across the street to see me.		f	f	f	
133. Often he makes me feel stupid the way he uses strange or big words.	f		f	f	
134. He must think life is easy the way he talks about my problems.	f				
135. You can never tell how he feels about things.			f	f	f
136. He treats me like a person.		t		t	t
137. He seems to be bored by a good deal of what I talk about.		f		f	
138. He will talk to me, but otherwise he seems pretty far away from me.	f	f		f	f
139. Even though he pays attention to me, he seems to be just another person to talk with, an outsider.	f	f		f	f
140. His concern about me is very obvious.			t	t	t
141. I get the feeling that he is all wrapped up in what I tell him about myself.				t	t

Appendix B

The Relationship Inventory was prepared and used in four parallel forms. The two Client forms differed only in the gender of the third person pronouns. The Therapist forms differed from the Client forms in that the positions of the first person and third-person pronouns were reversed. Thus, for example, the first item in the form for the therapist to answer (in respect to a male client) became "I respect him."

The Inventory is reproduced here just as it was used with clients who had male therapists, except that (a) code letters followed by plus or minus signs have been added, to indicate the scale to which each item belonged and whether it was positively or negatively stated in respect to this scale; and (b) items that were not used in the final scoring have been omitted.

The code letters signify the five scales, as follows:

- R = Level of regard
- E = Empathic understanding
- C = Congruence
- U = Unconditionality of regard
- W = Willingness to be known

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY - CLIENT FORM (Male Therapist)

(Please do not write your name on this form. It will be coded anonymously and your answers used for research purposes only).

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person could feel or behave in relation to another person. Please consider each statement with respect to whether you think it is true or not true in your present relationship with your therapist. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel it is true or not true. Please mark every one. Write in +1, +2, +3; or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+1 : I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

+2 : I feel it is true.

+3 : I strongly feel that it is true.

-1 : I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

-2 : I feel it is not true.

-3 : I strongly feel that it is not true.

R + ____ 1. He respects me.

E + ____ 2. He tries to see things through my eyes.

C - ____ 3. He pretends that he likes me or understands me more than he really does.

- U - ____ 4. His interest in me depends partly on what I am talking to him about.
- W + ____ 5. He is willing to tell me his own thoughts and feelings when he is sure that I really want to know them.
- R - ____ 6. He disapproves of me.
- E - ____ 7. He understands my words but not the way I feel.
- C + ____ 8. What he says to me never conflicts with what he thinks or feels.
- U + ____ 9. He always responds to me with warmth and interest - or always with coldness and disinterest.
- W - ____ 10. He tells me his opinions or feelings more than I really want to know them.
- R - ____ 11. He is curious about "the way I tick", but not really interested in me as a person.
- E + ____ 12. He is interested in knowing what my experiences mean to me.
- C - ____ 13. He is disturbed whenever I talk about or ask about certain things.
- U + ____ 14. His feeling toward me does not depend on how I am feeling towards him.
- W - ____ 15. He prefers to talk only about me and not at all about him.
- R + ____ 16. He likes seeing me.
- E + ____ 17. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
- C - ____ 18. I feel that he has unspoken feelings or concerns that are getting in the way of our relationship.
- U - ____ 19. His attitude toward me depends partly on how I am feeling about myself.
- W + ____ 20. He will freely tell me his own thoughts and feelings, when I want to know them.
- R - ____ 21. He is indifferent to me.
- E - ____ 22. At times he jumps to the conclusion that I feel more strongly or more concerned about something than I actually do.
- C + ____ 23. He behaves just the way that he is, in our relationship.
- U - ____ 24. Sometimes he responds to me in a more positive and friendly way than he does at other times.
- W - ____ 25. He says more about himself than I am really interested to hear.
- R + ____ 26. He appreciates me.
- E - ____ 27. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way, because he feels that way.
- C + ____ 28. I do not think that he hides anything from himself that he feels with me.
- U - ____ 29. He likes me in some ways, dislikes me in others.
- W - ____ 30. He adopts a professional role that makes it hard for me to know what he is like as a person.
- R + ____ 31. He is friendly and warm toward me.
- E + ____ 32. He understands me.
- U - ____ 34. If I feel negatively toward him he responds negatively to me.
- W - ____ 35. He tells me what he thinks about me, whether I want to know it or not.
- R + ____ 36. He cares about me.
- E - ____ 37. His own attitudes toward some of the things I say, or do, stop him from really understand me.
- C + ____ 38. He does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
- U + ____ 39. Whether I am expressing "good" feelings or "bad" ones seems to make no difference to how positively - or how negatively - he feels toward me.
- W - ____ 40. He is uncomfortable when I ask him something about himself.

- R - 41. He feels that I am dull and uninteresting.
- E - 42. He understands what I say, from a detached, objective point of view.
- C + 43. I feel that I can trust him to be honest with me.
- U - 44. Sometimes he is warmly responsive to me, at other times cold or disapproving.
- W - 45. He expresses ideas or feelings of his own that I am not really interested in.
- R + 46. He is interested in me.
- E + 47. He appreciates what my experiences feel like to me.
- C + 48. He is secure and comfortable in our relationship.
- U - 49. Depending on his mood, he sometimes responds to me with quite a lot more warmth and interest than he does at other times.
- W - 50. He wants to say as little as possible about his own thoughts and feelings.
- R - 51. He just tolerates me.
- C - 53. He is playing a role with me.
- U + 54. He is equally appreciative - or equally unappreciative - of me, whatever I am telling him about myself.
- W + 55. His own feelings and thoughts are always available to me, but never imposed on me.
- R - 56. He does not really care what happens to me.
- E - 57. He does not realize how strongly I feel about some of the things we discuss.
- C - 58. There are times when I feel that his outward response is quite different from his inner reaction to me.
- U - 59. His general feeling toward me varies considerably.
- W + 60. He is willing for me to use our time to get to know him better, if or when I want to.
- R + 61. He seems to really value me.
- E - 62. He responds to me mechanically.
- C - 63. I don't think that he is being honest with himself about the way he feels toward me.
- U + 64. Whether I like or dislike myself makes no difference to the way he feels about me.
- W - 65. He is more interested in expressing and communicating himself than in knowing and understanding me.
- R - 66. He dislikes me.
- C + 68. I feel that he is being genuine with me.
- U - 69. Sometimes he responds quite positively to me, at other times he seems indifferent.
- W - 70. He is unwilling to tell me how he feels about me.
- R - 71. He is impatient with me.
- C - 73. Sometimes he is not at all comfortable but we go on outwardly ignoring ti.
- U - 74. He likes me better when I behave in some ways than he does when I behave in other ways.
- W + 75. He is willing to tell me his actual responde to anything I say or do.
- R + 76. He feels deep affection for me.
- E + 77. He usually understands all of what I say to him.
- C + 78. He does not try to mislead me about his own thoughts or feelings.

- U + ____ 79. Whether I feel awful makes no difference to how warmly and appreciatively - or how coldly and unappreciatively - he feels toward me.
- W - ____ 80. He tends to evade any attempt that I make to get to know him better.
- R - ____ 81. He regards me as a disagreeable person.
- C - ____ 83. What he says gives a false impression of his total reaction to me.
- U + ____ 84. I can be very critical of him or very appreciative of him without it changing his feeling toward me.
- R - ____ 86. At times he feels contempt for me.
- E + ____ 87. When I do not say what I mean at all clearly he still understands me.
- C - ____ 88. He tries to avoid telling me anything that might upset me.
- U - ____ 89. His general feeling toward me (of liking, respect, dislike, trust, criticism, anger, etc.) reflects the way that I am feeling toward him.
- E - ____ 91. He tries to understand me from his own point of view.
- E + ____ 92. He can be deeply and fully aware of my most painful feelings without being distressed or burdened by them himself.

Appendix C

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

1. Name :

2. School :

3. Please check the ones you hold. Name the University from which you obtained it :

B.A. _____
 B. Ed. _____
 M.A. _____
 M. Ed. _____
 Diploma in Counselling _____

4. Number of years of experience as a counsellor (circle) :

- | | |
|-------|----------------------------------------|
| (a) 1 | (d) 4 |
| (b) 2 | (e) 5 |
| (c) 3 | (f) more than 5 (specify number _____) |

5. Time spent in Counselling :

- (a) full time
 (b) two-thirds time
 (c) one-half time
 (d) less than one-half time

6. Number of years of experience as a teacher (circle) :

- | | |
|-------|----------------------------------------|
| (a) 1 | (d) 4 |
| (b) 2 | (e) 5 |
| (c) 3 | (f) more than 5 (specify number _____) |

7. Please check the courses you have taken or are taking :

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|-----|-----------------------------------------|
| (a) | Educational Psychology | 276 | (1st year) |
| (b) | " | " | 308 (Guidance) |
| (c) | " | " | 476 |
| (d) | " | " | 478 (Tests & Measurement) |
| (d) | " | " | 310 (Personality Theory) |
| (f) | " | " | 508 (Group Testing & Vocational Choice) |
| (g) | " | " | 510 (Theories of Counselling) |
| (h) | " | " | 512 (Practicum) |
| (i) | " | " | 574 (Individual Testing) |
| (j) | " | " | 570 (Child Development) |
| (k) | " | " | 572 (Adolescent Psychology) |
| (l) | " | " | 502 (Statistics & Research Design) |
| (m) | Abnormal Psychology | | |
| (n) | Social Psychology | | |
| (o) | Sociology | | |
| (p) | Anthropology | | |

Appendix D

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES USED TO CLASSIFY RESPONDENTS

N = 793 N = 607 N = 186

Occupational Title	National			National English			National French		
	Score	S.D.		Score	S.D.		Score	S.D.	
<u>Professional</u>									
Accountant	63.4	19.2		62.9	19.4		65.4	18.4	
Architect	78.1	18.3		77.6	18.4		79.6	17.9	
Biologist	72.6	20.9		73.4	20.2		69.7	23.0	
Catholic Priest	72.8	25.5		72.5	25.0		77.2	26.6	
Chemist	73.5	19.3		73.3	18.8		73.9	21.1	
Civil Engineer	73.1	19.0		72.6	18.8		75.1	19.3	
County Court Judge	82.5	18.6		81.0	18.6		87.4	17.7	
Druggist	69.3	20.1		68.5	19.8		72.0	20.5	
Economist	62.2	22.3		63.0	21.6		59.5	24.2	
High School Teacher	66.1	20.7		67.8	20.0		60.4	22.2	
Lawyer	82.3	16.7		81.6	17.0		84.4	15.5	
Mathematician	72.7	20.1		73.7	20.1		69.5	19.9	
Mine Safety Analyst	57.1	20.5		57.2	20.5		56.6	20.8	
Mining Engineer	68.8	20.5		68.6	20.1		69.3	21.6	
Physician	87.2	15.9		87.5	16.1		86.1	15.2	
Physicists	77.6	21.4		79.9	20.0		69.3	24.1	
Protestant Minister	67.8	26.3		71.7	23.0		53.7	32.1	
Psychologist	74.9	20.3		76.0	19.6		71.3	22.2	
Public Grade School Teacher	59.6	20.5		59.8	20.8		58.8	19.2	
University Professor	84.6	17.3		86.1	16.9		79.9	17.7	
Veterinarian	66.7	21.3		66.7	20.9		66.6	22.5	
<u>Semi Professional</u>									
Airline Pilot	66.1	20.5		67.4	19.9		61.6	21.8	
Author	64.8	21.7		65.8	21.7		61.4	21.6	
Ballet Dancer	49.1	26.2		51.6	25.2		40.7	27.6	
Chiropractor	68.4	22.0		67.2	21.6		72.2	22.9	
Commercial Artist	57.2	20.5		58.1	20.4		54.1	20.6	
Computer Programmer	53.8	21.6		53.6	21.2		54.8	22.9	
Disc Jockey	38.0	23.1		38.2	23.0		37.3	25.6	
Draughtsman	60.0	20.6		59.9	20.4		60.0	21.1	
Funeral Director	54.9	23.7		55.2	22.8		53.7	26.5	

OCCUPATIONS PRESTIGE SCORES BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES USED TO CLASSIFY RESPONDENTS

Occupational Title	National		National English		National French	
	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.
<u>Semi-Professional (con't)</u>						
Jazz Musician	40.9	24.5	40.9	24.3	41.2	25.2
Journalist	60.9	20.0	62.3	19.5	56.4	21.0
Medical or Dental Technician	67.5	21.7	66.7	21.8	70.0	21.4
Musician	52.1	22.9	53.7	22.5	46.6	23.2
Musician in a Symphony Orchestra	56.0	23.0	58.0	22.1	49.3	25.0
Physiotherapist	72.1	19.4	72.3	19.0	71.3	20.6
Playground Director	42.8	22.3	43.1	21.7	41.8	24.1
Professional Athlete	54.1	24.2	54.5	24.3	52.9	23.9
Professionally Trained Forester	60.0	20.6	60.4	19.9	58.9	22.8
Professionally Trained Librarian	58.1	21.7	58.5	21.2	56.7	23.1
Registered Nurse	64.7	21.4	66.1	20.8	59.9	22.5
Research Technician.	66.9	19.1	67.1	19.1	66.1	19.2
Sculptor	56.9	23.6	58.0	23.5	53.5	23.9
Social Worker	55.1	24.0	57.4	23.2	47.4	25.2
Surveyor	62.0	20.4	60.6	20.1	66.9	20.7
T.V. Announcer	57.6	21.6	57.9	21.4	56.5	22.4
T.V. Cameraman	48.3	21.4	47.8	21.0	49.9	22.6
T.V. Director	62.1	21.5	63.1	21.4	58.9	21.7
T.V. Star	65.6	26.8	67.7	25.9	58.7	28.6
YMCA Director	58.2	21.8	59.2	21.0	54.5	24.4
<u>Proprietors, Managers and Officials, Large</u>						
Administrative Officer in Federal Civil Service	68.8	20.1	69.9	19.6	64.9	21.6
Advertising Executive	56.5	21.8	59.4	21.2	46.5	20.9
Bank Manager	70.9	19.3	72.1	19.4	67.1	18.5
Building Contractor	56.5	19.3	56.4	18.9	56.7	20.7
Colonel in the Army	70.8	22.0	71.6	21.3	68.4	24.2
Department Head in City Government	71.3	21.3	74.5	19.5	60.4	23.7

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES USED TO CLASSIFY RESPONDENTS

Occupational Title	National		National English		National French	
	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.
<u>Proprietors, Managers and Officials, Large (con't)</u>						
General Manager of a Manufacturing Plant	69.1	19.2	70.4	18.5	64.9	20.8
Mayor of a Large City	79.9	20.4	80.6	20.2	77.5	20.7
Member of Canadian Cabinet	83.3	19.9	84.2	18.8	80.4	22.9
Member of Canadian House of Commons	84.8	18.8	84.9	18.4	84.5	20.2
Member of Canadian Senate	86.1	21.1	86.0	20.8	86.1	22.3
Merchandise Buyer for a Department Store	51.1	19.3	52.7	19.0	45.5	19.3
Owner of a Manufacturing Plant	69.4	21.3	69.8	20.6	67.9	23.4
Provincial Premier	89.9	18.1	88.7	19.1	93.6	13.3
Wholesale Distributor.	47.9	20.5	49.1	19.9	43.6	22.0
<u>Proprietors, Managers and Officials, Small</u>						
Advertising Copy Writer	48.9	20.6	48.3	19.8	50.9	22.8
Beauty Operator	35.2	20.9	34.4	20.3	37.9	22.6
Construction Foreman	51.1	20.0	50.4	19.7	53.3	20.8
Driving Instructor	41.6	21.6	40.0	20.9	46.9	23.2
Foreman in a Factory	50.9	19.3	49.2	18.6	56.8	20.4
Government Purchasing Agent	56.8	21.6	56.9	21.0	56.2	23.4
Insurance Claims Investigator	51.1	20.1	50.8	20.1	52.0	20.2
Job Counsellor	58.3	20.7	58.7	20.0	56.8	23.0
Livestock Buyer	39.6	21.5	40.6	20.6	36.1	24.2
Lunchroom Operator	31.6	21.4	29.2	20.3	39.9	23.2
Manager of a Real Estate Office	58.3	20.9	58.8	20.7	56.8	21.8
Manager of a Supermarket	52.5	20.2	52.7	20.0	51.9	20.6
Member of a City Council	62.9	21.4	64.7	20.3	57.1	24.0
Motel Owner	51.6	23.5	50.9	21.7	53.8	28.9
Owner of a Food Store	47.8	21.3	29.7	20.8	41.7	21.9
Public Relations Man	60.5	19.4	60.3	19.2	61.4	20.2

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES USED TO CLASSIFY RESPONDENTS

Occupational Title	National				National English				National French			
	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.
<u>Proprietors, Managers and Officials, Small (con't)</u>												
Railroad Ticket Agent	35.7	21.1	26.5	20.6	33.0	22.5	20.6	22.5	33.0	22.5	20.6	22.5
Sawmill Operator	37.0	21.7	36.4	21.4	38.9	22.5	21.4	22.5	38.9	22.5	21.4	22.5
Service Station Manager	41.5	20.4	42.5	18.9	38.1	24.5	18.9	24.5	38.1	24.5	18.9	24.5
Ship's Pilot	59.6	22.7	59.6	22.4	59.7	23.5	22.4	23.5	59.7	23.5	22.4	23.5
Superintendent of a Construction Job.	53.9	20.4	55.3	20.4	49.0	19.5	20.4	19.5	49.0	19.5	20.4	19.5
Trade Union Business Agent	49.2	21.0	48.6	20.9	51.1	21.3	20.9	21.3	51.1	21.3	20.9	21.3
Travel Agent	46.6	20.7	45.0	19.5	52.0	23.5	19.5	23.5	52.0	23.5	19.5	23.5
<u>Clerical and Sales</u>												
Air Hostess	57.0	21.1	55.7	21.0	61.0	20.7	21.0	20.7	61.0	20.7	21.0	20.7
Bank Teller	42.3	21.0	42.4	20.1	41.9	24.0	20.1	24.0	41.9	24.0	20.1	24.0
Bill Collector	29.4	21.5	26.8	21.1	38.4	20.4	21.1	20.4	38.4	20.4	21.1	20.4
Bookkeeper	49.4	20.2	50.0	20.1	47.3	20.7	20.1	20.7	47.3	20.7	20.1	20.7
Cashier in a Supermarket	31.1	21.4	30.5	21.1	33.0	22.1	21.1	22.1	33.0	22.1	21.1	22.1
Clerk in an Office	35.6	20.3	35.0	19.8	37.8	22.1	19.8	22.1	37.8	22.1	19.8	22.1
File Clerk	32.7	21.2	31.5	20.4	36.7	25.1	20.4	25.1	36.7	25.1	20.4	25.1
IBM Key punch Operator	47.7	21.5	46.5	21.0	51.9	22.8	21.0	22.8	51.9	22.8	21.0	22.8
Insurance Agent	47.3	19.7	46.6	19.1	49.7	21.5	19.1	21.5	49.7	21.5	19.1	21.5
Manufacturer's Representative	52.1	19.1	51.7	19.0	53.5	19.1	19.0	19.1	53.5	19.1	19.0	19.1
Post Office Clerk	37.2	21.9	37.2	21.6	36.9	22.8	21.6	22.8	36.9	22.8	21.6	22.8
Real Estate Agent	47.1	21.1	46.2	20.1	49.8	23.9	20.1	23.9	49.8	23.9	20.1	23.9
Receptionist	38.7	20.9	39.7	20.4	35.5	22.1	20.4	22.1	35.5	22.1	20.4	22.1
Sales Clerk in a Store	26.5	19.7	26.6	19.4	25.9	20.7	19.4	20.7	25.9	20.7	19.4	20.7
Shipping Clerk	30.9	20.1	30.7	19.3	31.7	22.7	19.3	22.7	31.7	22.7	19.3	22.7
Stenographer	46.0	20.2	44.6	19.6	50.6	21.5	19.6	21.5	50.6	21.5	19.6	21.5
Stockroom Attendant	25.8	19.2	24.9	18.8	29.0	20.1	18.8	20.1	29.0	20.1	18.8	20.1
Telephone Operator	38.1	22.0	37.6	21.7	39.9	23.0	21.7	23.0	39.9	23.0	21.7	23.0
Telephone Solicitor	26.7	23.0	28.3	23.2	21.7	21.6	23.2	21.6	21.7	21.6	23.2	21.6
Travelling Salesman	40.2	21.1	38.8	21.0	45.1	20.6	21.0	20.6	45.1	20.6	21.0	20.6
Truck Dispatcher	32.2	20.4	32.1	20.1	43.7	21.2	20.1	21.2	43.7	21.2	20.1	21.2
Typist	41.9	20.7	41.1	20.1	44.7	22.4	20.1	22.4	44.7	22.4	20.1	22.4
Used Car Salesman	31.2	21.0	30.4	20.0	34.0	24.0	20.0	24.0	34.0	24.0	20.0	24.0

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES USED TO CLASSIFY RESPONDENTS

Occupational Title	National		National English		National French	
	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.
<u>Skilled</u>						
Airplane Mechanic	50.3	22.4	49.3	22.1	53.4	23.1
Baker	38.9	20.5	38.8	20.1	39.4	22.1
Bricklayer	36.2	21.6	36.0	21.3	36.9	22.6
Butcher in a Store	34.8	20.2	34.7	19.7	35.0	21.6
Coal Miner	27.6	22.1	26.2	21.9	32.3	22.4
Cook in a Restaurant	29.7	21.0	28.9	21.3	32.3	19.8
Custom Seamstress	33.4	20.3	33.7	19.3	32.5	23.3
Diamond Driller	44.5	21.7	44.8	21.4	43.2	22.5
Electrician	50.2	20.5	49.5	20.5	52.3	20.4
House Carpenter	38.9	20.7	38.7	20.3	39.4	22.1
House Painter	29.9	19.4	29.0	19.0	33.0	20.4
Locomotive Engineer	38.9	22.2	50.9	21.7	42.2	22.7
Machinist	44.2	21.9	44.0	21.9	45.0	22.0
Machine Set-up Man in a Factory	42.1	21.4	41.9	21.5	42.6	21.4
Mucking Machine Operator	31.5	20.5	30.3	20.3	35.1	20.5
Plumber	42.6	20.8	42.7	20.7	42.4	21.5
Power Crane Operator	40.2	20.7	39.8	20.7	41.4	21.0
Power Lineman	40.9	21.2	41.8	20.3	57.5	24.3
Pump-House Engineer	38.9	21.8	40.6	21.6	33.3	21.7
Railroad Brakeman	37.1	20.9	37.5	20.8	35.9	21.2
Railroad Conductor	45.3	21.8	44.5	21.2	48.2	23.5
Saw Sharpener	20.7	20.1	19.6	19.1	24.6	22.9
Sheet Metal Worker	35.9	20.5	36.8	19.9	32.5	22.6
T.V. Repairman	27.2	20.4	36.5	20.2	39.3	20.9
Tool and Die Maker	42.5	22.2	44.1	21.8	36.7	22.6
Typesetter	42.2	20.5	40.0	19.6	49.9	21.4
Welder	41.8	21.5	41.4	21.3	43.2	22.2
<u>Semi-Skilled</u>						
Aircraft Worker	43.7	21.6	43.6	21.6	43.9	21.8
Apprentice to a Master Craftsman	33.9	23.1	38.9	21.9	18.0	19.5

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES USED TO CLASSIFY RESPONDENTS

Occupational Title	National				National English				National French			
	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.
<u>Semi-Skilled</u>												
Assembly Line Worker	28.2	20.4	27.6	20.3	30.4	20.8	27.6	20.3	30.4	20.8	27.6	20.3
Automobile Repairman	28.1	20.8	36.9	20.2	41.9	22.2	36.9	20.2	41.9	22.2	36.9	20.2
Automobile Worker	35.9	21.2	34.4	20.6	41.3	22.2	34.4	20.6	41.3	22.2	34.4	20.6
Barber	39.3	20.2	38.9	19.6	40.4	22.2	38.9	19.6	40.4	22.2	38.9	19.6
Bartender	20.2	19.5	19.4	19.5	22.8	19.2	19.4	19.5	22.8	19.2	19.4	19.5
Book Binder	35.2	20.1	33.5	19.6	41.0	20.8	33.5	19.6	41.0	20.8	33.5	19.6
Bus Driver	35.9	21.3	35.8	21.9	36.1	19.2	35.8	21.9	36.1	19.2	35.8	21.9
Cod Fisherman	23.4	21.0	24.8	21.0	18.6	20.5	24.8	21.0	18.6	20.5	24.8	21.0
Firefighter	43.5	24.4	44.2	24.5	41.4	23.8	44.2	24.5	41.4	23.8	44.2	24.5
Fruit Packer in a Cannery	23.2	20.7	22.0	20.3	27.6	21.4	22.0	20.3	27.6	21.4	22.0	20.3
Legger	24.9	21.3	25.4	20.9	23.2	22.5	25.4	20.9	23.2	22.5	25.4	20.9
Longshoreman	26.1	21.1	26.5	21.0	24.9	21.5	26.5	21.0	24.9	21.5	26.5	21.0
Loom Operator	33.3	19.7	32.3	19.3	36.4	20.7	32.3	19.3	36.4	20.7	32.3	19.3
Machine Operator in a Factory	34.9	22.2	33.1	21.7	41.1	23.0	33.1	21.7	41.1	23.0	33.1	21.7
Newspaper Pressman	43.0	20.6	44.3	20.2	38.4	21.2	44.3	20.2	38.4	21.2	44.3	20.2
Oil Field Worker	35.3	21.9	34.6	21.6	37.5	22.7	34.6	21.6	37.5	22.7	34.6	21.6
Oiler in a Ship	27.6	21.2	26.3	20.2	31.7	23.7	26.3	20.2	31.7	23.7	26.3	20.2
Paper Making Machine Tender	31.6	20.4	29.5	19.8	38.2	20.8	29.5	19.8	38.2	20.8	29.5	19.8
Policeman	51.6	23.0	52.1	23.0	49.9	22.9	52.1	23.0	49.9	22.9	52.1	23.0
Private in the Army	238.4	22.9	29.6	23.5	24.4	20.4	29.6	23.5	24.4	20.4	29.6	23.5
Production Worker in the Electronics Industry	50.3	23.0	50.4	22.7	52.2	23.7	50.4	22.7	52.2	23.7	50.4	22.7
Professional Babysitter	25.9	22.5	25.2	22.3	28.5	23.1	25.2	22.3	28.5	23.1	25.2	22.3
Quarry Worker	26.7	22.3	24.4	21.3	24.0	23.8	24.4	21.3	24.0	23.8	24.4	21.3
Sewing Machine Operator	28.2	19.9	26.7	19.2	33.1	21.3	26.7	19.2	33.1	21.3	26.7	19.2
Steam Boiler Fireman	32.8	21.1	33.9	21.0	29.0	21.0	33.9	21.0	29.0	21.0	33.9	21.0
Steam Roller Operator	32.2	20.7	32.0	20.2	32.7	22.3	32.0	20.2	32.7	22.3	32.0	20.2
Steel Mill Worker	34.3	20.6	35.2	20.9	31.2	19.1	35.2	20.9	31.2	19.1	35.2	20.9
Textile Mill Worker	28.8	19.5	28.6	19.5	29.7	19.6	28.6	19.5	29.7	19.6	28.6	19.5
Timber Cruiser	40.3	22.6	36.1	21.5	53.1	21.3	36.1	21.5	53.1	21.3	36.1	21.5
Trailer Truck Driver	32.8	22.0	31.8	21.7	36.5	22.4	31.8	21.7	36.5	22.4	31.8	21.7
Troller	23.6	20.7	26.3	20.9	16.9	18.8	26.3	20.9	16.9	18.8	26.3	20.9
Worker in a Meat Packing Plant	25.2	20.3	24.3	19.7	28.3	22.1	24.3	19.7	28.3	22.1	24.3	19.7

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES USED TO CLASSIFY RESPONDENTS

Occupational Title	National		National English		National French	
	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.	Score	S.D.
<u>Unskilled</u>						
Carpenter's Helper	23.1	20.0	22.5	20.0	24.9	19.8
Construction Labourer	26.5	22.7	24.4	22.1	33.8	23.1
Elevator Operator in a Building	20.1	20.7	21.8	20.9	14.4	18.8
Filling Station Attendant	23.3	20.3	22.2	19.7	27.7	22.1
Garbage Collector	14.8	20.0	15.0	20.3	13.8	18.9
Hospital Attendant	34.9	24.9	34.2	24.2	37.6	26.8
Housekeeper in a Private Home	28.8	23.5	28.5	24.1	30.0	21.2
Janitor	17.3	10.2	16.3	18.5	20.8	21.0
Laundress	19.3	20.1	19.3	19.8	19.6	21.3
Mailman	36.1	23.0	36.2	23.0	35.8	23.3
Museum Attendant	30.4	21.8	31.5	21.2	26.9	23.1
Newspaper Peddler	14.8	19.0	14.3	18.7	16.5	20.1
Railroad Sectionhand	27.3	21.8	25.7	21.7	32.6	21.5
Taxicab Driver	25.1	20.3	24.3	19.8	27.8	21.7
Waitress in a Restaurant	19.9	19.4	19.1	19.0	22.6	20.3
Warehouse Hand	21.3	18.3	20.2	18.1	25.1	18.7
Whistle Punk	18.4	21.2	14.3	18.7	29.4	23.4
Worker in a Dry Cleaning or Laundry Plant	20.8	19.6	20.3	19.4	22.4	19.9
<u>Farmer</u>						
Commercial Farmer	42.0	22.3	41.7	22.0	42.9	23.3
Dairy Farmer	44.2	22.9	43.3	22.4	47.3	24.5
Farm Labourer	21.5	22.0	19.6	21.7	27.9	22.0
Farm Owner and Operator	44.1	23.7	44.8	23.2	41.7	25.5
Hog Farmer	33.0	23.6	31.3	23.5	38.8	23.1
Part Time Farmer	25.1	22.4	26.6	22.3	20.1	21.9
<u>Not in Labour Force</u>						
Archaeopotrist	63.7	23.9	64.7	22.5	59.7	28.4
Biologer	64.2	24.1	66.0	22.8	57.8	27.4

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES USED TO CLASSIFY RESPONDENTS

Occupational Title	National			National English			National French		
	Score	S.D.		Score	S.D.		Score	S.D.	
Not in Labour Force (con't)									
Occupation of my family's main wage earner	50.9	25.1		50.3	24.5		53.0	27.0	
Occupation of my father when I was 16	42.5	25.6		42.6	25.2		42.2	26.8	
Someone who lives off inherited wealth	45.8	31.5		45.8	31.9		46.0	30.2	
Someone who lives off property holdings	48.7	25.9		46.9	25.4		54.4	26.7	
Someone who lives off stocks and bonds	56.9	27.9		56.7	28.0		57.5	27.8	
Someone who lives on relief	7.3	15.9		7.2	15.5		7.8	17.4	

Appendix E

Counselees:

This questionnaire deals with a study which I am conducting as a graduate student in educational psychology, University of Alberta.

I would be grateful if you would assist me in this research by completing this questionnaire.

Name:

School:

Grade:

Father's Occupation:

RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE (AND SCORING KEY)

People feel differently about some people than they do about others. There are a number of statements below that describe a variety of ways that one person may feel about another person, or ways that one person may act toward another person. Consider each statement carefully and decide whether it is true or false when applied to your present relationship with your counsellor. If the statement seems to be mostly true, then circle true; if it is mostly not true, then circle false.

- | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1. He seems to hold things back, rather than tell me what he really thinks. | T | F |
| 2. He understands my words but does not know what I feel. | T | F |
| 3. He understands me. | T | F |
| 4. He understands exactly how I see things | T | F |
| 5. He is often disappointed in me. | T | F |
| 6. He seems to like me no matter what I say to him | T | F |
| 7. He is impatient with me. | T | F |
| 8. He may understand me but he does not know how I feel. | T | F |
| 9. Sometimes he seems interested in me while other times he does not seem to care about me. | T | F |
| 10. He often misunderstands what I am trying to say. | T | F |
| 11. He almost always seems very concerned about me. | T | F |
| 12. Sometimes I feel that what he says to me is very different from the way he really feels. | T | F |
| 13. He is a person you can really trust. | T | F |
| 14. Sometimes he will argue with me just to prove he is right. | T | F |

- | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 15. | Sometimes he seems to be uncomfortable with me, but we go on and pay no attention to it. | T | F |
| 16. | Some things I say seem to upset him. | T | F |
| 17. | He can read me like a book. | T | F |
| 18. | He usually is not very interested in what I have to say. | T | F |
| 19. | He feels indifferent about me. | T | F |
| 20. | He acts too professional. | T | F |
| 21. | I am just another student to him. | T | F |
| 22. | I feel that I can trust him to be honest with me. | T | F |
| 23. | He ignores some of my feelings. | T | F |
| 24. | He likes to see me. | T | F |
| 25. | He knows more about me than I do about myself. | T | F |
| 26. | Sometimes he is so much "with me", in my feelings that I am not at all distracted by his presence. | T | F |
| 27. | I can usually count on him to tell me what he really thinks or feels. | T | F |
| 28. | He appreciates me. | T | F |
| 29. | He sure makes me think hard about myself. | T | F |
| 30. | I feel that he is being genuine with me. | T | F |
| 31. | Even when I cannot say quite what I mean, he knows how I feel. | T | F |
| 32. | He usually helps me to know how I am feeling by putting my feelings into words for me. | T | F |
| 33. | He seems like a very cold person. | T | F |
| 34. | He must understand me, but I often think he is wrong. | T | F |
| 35. | I feel that he really thinks I am worthwhile. | T | F |
| 36. | Even if I were to criticize him he would still like me. | T | F |

- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 37. | He likes me better when I agree with him. | T | F |
| 38. | He seems to follow almost every feeling I have while I am with him. | T | F |
| 39. | He usually uses just the right words when he tries to understand how I am feeling. | T | F |
| 40. | If it were not for him I would probably never be forced to think about some of the things that trouble me. | T | F |
| 41. | He pretends that he likes me more than he really does. | T | F |
| 42. | He really listens to everything I say. | T | F |
| 43. | Sometimes he seems to be putting up a professional front. | T | F |
| 44. | Sometimes he is so much "with me" that with only the slightest hint he is able to accurately sense some of my deepest feelings. | T | F |
| 45. | I feel safer with him than I do with almost any other person. | T | F |
| 46. | His voice usually sounds very serious. | T | F |
| 47. | I often cannot understand what he is trying to tell me. | T | F |
| 48. | Sometimes he sort of "pulls back" and examines me. | T | F |
| 49. | I am afraid of him. | T | F |
| 50. | He seems to pressure me to talk about things that are important to me. | | |
| 51. | Whatever he says usually fits right in with what I am feeling. | T | F |
| 52. | He sometimes seems more interested in what he himself says than in what I say. | T | F |
| 53. | He tells me things that he does not mean. | T | F |
| 54. | He often does not seem to be genuinely himself. | T | F |

- | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 55. He is a very sincere person. | T | F |
| 56. With him I feel more free to really be myself than with almost anyone else I know. | T | F |
| 57. He sometimes pretends to understand me, when he really does not. | T | F |
| 58. He usually knows exactly what I mean, sometimes even before I finish saying it. | T | F |
| 59. He accepts me the way I am even though he wants me to be better. | T | F |
| 60. Whether I am talking about "good" or "bad" feelings it seems to make no real difference in the way he feels toward me. | T | F |
| 61. In many of our talks I feel that he pushes me to talk about things that are upsetting. | T | F |
| 62. He often leads me into talking about some of my deepest feelings. | T | F |
| 63. He usually makes me work hard at knowing myself. | T | F |
| 64. Sometimes I feel like going to sleep while I am talking with him. | T | F |
| 65. He is curious about what makes me act like I do, but he is not really interested in me. | T | F |
| 66. He sometimes completely understands me so that he knows what I am feeling even when I am hiding my feelings. | T | F |
| 67. I sometimes feel safe enough with him to really say how I feel. | T | F |
| 68. I feel I can trust him more than anyone else I know. | T | F |

- | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 69. | Whatever I talk about is okay with him. | T | F |
| 70. | He helps me know myself better by sometimes pointing to feelings within me that I had been unaware of. | T | F |
| 71. | He seem like a real person, instead of just a teacher. | T | F |
| 72. | I can learn a lot about myself from talking with him. | T | F |
| 73. | In spite of all he knows about me, he seems to trust my feelings about what is right and wrong for me. | T | F |
| 74. | Sometimes he is upset when I see him but he tries to hide it. | T | F |
| 75. | He would never knowingly hurt me. | T | F |
| 76. | He is a phony. | T | F |
| 77. | He is the kind of person who might lie to me if he thought it would help me. | T | F |
| 78. | When he sees me he seems to be "just doing a job". | T | F |
| 79. | In spite of the bad things that he knows about me, he seems to still like me. | T | F |
| 80. | I sometimes get the feeling that for him the most important thing is that I should really like him. | T | F |
| 81. | There is something about the way he reacts to what I tell him that makes me uncertain whether he can keep my confidences to himself. | T | F |
| 82. | He gives me so much advice I sometimes think he is trying to live my life for me. | T | F |
| 83. | He never knows when to stop talking about something which is not very meaningful to me. | T | F |
| 84. | He sometimes cuts me off abruptly just when I am leading up to something very important to me. | T | F |

85. He frequently acts so restless that I get the feeling
he can hardly wait for the day to end. T F
86. There are lots of things I could tell him, but I am not
sure how he would react to them, so I keep them to myself. T F
87. He constantly reminds me that we are friends though I
have a feeling that he drags this into the conversation. T F
88. He sometimes tries to make a joke out of something I
feel really upset about. T F
89. He is sometimes so rude I only accept it because he is
supposed to be helping me. T F
90. Sometimes he seems to be playing "cat and mouse" with me. T F
91. He often points out what a lot of help he is giving me
even though it does not feel like it to me. T F
92. It is hard to feel comfortable with him because he sometimes
seems to be trying out some new theory on me. T F
93. He's got a job to do and does it. That is the only reason
he does not tell me off. T F
94. He is always relaxed, I do not think anything could get
him excited. T F
95. I don't think he has ever smiled. T F
96. He is always the same. T F
97. I would like to be like him. T F
98. He makes feel like a guinea pig or some kind of animal. T F
99. He uses the same words over and over again till I'm bored. T F
100. Usually I can lie to him and he never knows the
difference. T F

- | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 101. | He may like me, but he does not like the things I talk about. | T | F |
| 102. | I don't think he really cares if I live or die. | T | F |
| 103. | He doesn't like me as a person, but continues to see me as a student anyway. | T | F |
| 104. | I think he is dumb. | T | F |
| 105. | He never says anything that makes him sound like a real person. | T | F |
| 106. | He is all right, but I really don't trust him. | T | F |
| 107. | If I make mistakes or miss an interview, he really gives me trouble about it. | T | F |
| 108. | He lets me talk about anything. | T | F |
| 109. | He probably laughs about the things that I have said to him. | T | F |
| 110. | I don't think he knows what is the matter with me. | T | F |
| 111. | He sometimes looks as worried as I feel. | T | F |
| 112. | He is really a cold fish. | T | F |
| 113. | There are times when I don't have to speak; he knows how I feel. | T | F |
| 114. | If I am happy or if I am sad, it makes no difference, he is always the same. | T | F |
| 115. | He really wants to understand me, I can tell by the way he acts. | T | F |
| 116. | He knows what it feels like to be ill. | T | F |
| 117. | He must think he is God, the way he talks about things. | T | F |
| 118. | He really wants to understand me, I can tell by the way he asks questions. | T | F |

- | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 119. | He must think that he is God, the way he treats me. | T | F |
| 120. | He rarely makes me talk about anything that would be uncomfortable. | T | F |
| 121. | He interrupts me whenever I am talking about something that really means a lot to me. | T | F |
| 122. | When I am talking about things that mean a great deal to me, he acts like they don't mean a thing. | T | F |
| 123. | I can tell by his expressions sometimes that he says things that he does not mean. | T | F |
| 124. | He really wants me to act a certain way, and says so. | T | F |
| 125. | There are a lot of things that I would like to talk about, but he won't let me. | T | F |
| 126. | He really likes me and shows it. | T | F |
| 127. | I think he could like someone, but I don't think he could love anybody. | T | F |
| 128. | There are times when he is silent for long periods, and then says things that don't have much to do with what we have been talking about. | T | F |
| 129. | When he is wrong he doesn't try to hide it. | T | F |
| 130. | He acts like he knows it all. | T | F |
| 131. | If he had his way, he wouldn't walk across the street to see me. | T | F |
| 132. | Often he makes me feel stupid the way he uses strange or big words. | T | F |
| 133. | He must think life is easy the way he talks about my problems. | T | F |

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| 134. You can never tell how he feels about things. | T | F |
| 135. He treats me like a person. | T | F |
| 136. He seems to be bored by a good deal of what I talk about. | T | F |
| 137. He will talk to me, but otherwise he seems pretty far
away from me. | T | F |
| 138. Even though he pays attention to me, he seems to be just
another person to talk with, an outsider. | T | F |
| 139. His concern about me is very obvious. | T | F |
| 140. I get the feeling that he is all wrapped up in what I
tell him about myself. | T | F |

Appendix F

5721 - 112 Street, # 303
Edmonton, Alberta

October 27, 1967

To : Principal,

Attention : Counsellor.

The Edmonton Public School Board has granted me permission to use some of their schools, in which to collect data for my thesis. Dr. John Paterson, Director of Counselling, has agreed to give me guidance and support. Dr. Harvey Zingle is my thesis advisor.

Your school is one of the twelve which have been recommended for my use.

I would like to administer a questionnaire to the students whom the above mentioned counsellor has interviewed at least twice from the beginning of September 1967 to the beginning of January 1968. I should hope that by January 1968, there will be a good number of counselees who will have been interviewed a few times (4, 5, or 6 times).

If you are willing to co-operate, I would appreciate it, if the counsellor would take class lists and put checkmarks after a student's name, each time he or she is interviewed.

I would also be grateful if you would inform me of your decision as soon as possible by calling me at Allendale Junior High (434-4756, on Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday) or at Vernon-Barford Junior High (434-9406, on Thursday or Friday).

The counsellors could also speak to me at the inservice training session on Monday, November 6, 1967.

Yours sincerely,

Rita Pierog.

Appendix G

Table XVI

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Empathy Means for the
Variable, Number of Years of Counselling Experience

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	7	160.217	1.793	.090
Within groups	191	89.357		

Table XVII

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Congruence Means for the
Variable, Number of Years of Counselling Experience

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	7	105.737	.986	.443
Within groups	191	107.235		

Table XVIII

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Acceptance Means for the
Variable, Number of Years of Counselling Experience

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	7	228.209	1.299	.305
Within groups	191	190.263		

Table XIX

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Total Means for the
Variable, Number of Years of Counselling Experience

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	7	1320.669	1.259	.273
Within groups	191	1049.122		

Table XX

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Empathy Means for the
Variable, The Amount of Time Now Spent in Counselling

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	3	127.764	1.399	.244
Within groups	195	91.310		

Table XXI

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Congruence Means for the
Variable, the Amount of Time Now Spent in Counselling

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	3	286.853	2.747	.044
Within groups	195	104.418		

Table XXII

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Acceptance Means for the
Variable, the Amount of Time Now Spent in Counselling

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	3	736.991	4.023	.008
Within groups	195	183.215		

Table XXIII

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Total Means for the
Variable, the Amount of Time Now Spent in Counselling

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	3	2851.458	2.765	.043
Within groups	195	1031.142		

Table XXIV

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Empathy Means for the
Variable, the Number of Years of Teaching Experience

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	10	221.680	2.609	.005
Within groups	188	84.957		

Table XXV

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Congruence Means for the Variable, the Number of Years of Teaching Experience

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	10	198.929	1.945	.042
Within groups	188	102.302		

Table XXVI

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Acceptance Means for the Variable, the Number of Years of Teaching Experience

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	10	462.894	2.613	.005
Within groups	188	177.174		

Table XXVII

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Total Means for the Variable, the Number of Years of Teaching Experience

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	10	2363.0061	2.388	.011
Within groups	188	989.345		

Table XXVIII

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Empathy Means for
the Variable, Degree Held

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	2	221.107	2.442	.0896
Within groups	196	90.543		

Table XXIX

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Congruence Means
for the Variable, Degree Held

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	2	61.709	.573	.565
Within groups	196	107.646		

Table XXX

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Acceptance Means
for the Variable, Degree Held

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	2	136.473	.710	.493
Within groups	196	192.167		

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Total Means
for the Variable, Degree Held

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	2	1184.063	1.120	.328
Within groups	196	1057.443		

Table XXXII

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Empathy Means for the
Variable, the Number of Courses in Counselling Taken at
the Graduate Level

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	5	122.043	1.340	.249
Within groups	193	91.680		

Table XXXIII

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Congruence Means for
the Variable, the Number of Courses in Counselling
Taken at the Graduate Level

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	5	131.654	1.236	.294
Within groups	193	106.348		

Table XXXIV

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Acceptance Means
for the Variable, the Number of Courses in
Counselling Taken at the Graduate Level

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between Groups	5	1681.337	1.998	.081
Within groups	193	1042.592		

Table XXXV

Analysis of Covariance on the Adjusted Total Means for the
Variable, the Number of Courses in Counselling Taken
at the Graduate Level

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	Adjusted F	Probability
Between groups	5	1681.337	1.613	.158
Within groups	193	1042.592		

B29897